BV4390
.C62C84
copy 2

3.31.08

Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Prof. John DeWitt, D.D.

Division BV4390

Section .C62C84

copy 2

WITH COMPLIMENTS OF
T. & T. CLARK
PUBLISHERS
EDINBURGH

MODERN CRITICISM

AND

CLEMENT'S EPISTLES TO VIRGINS.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, ...	HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.
DUBLIN, .	GEORGE HERBERT.
NEW YORK, ...	SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

MODERN CRITICISM

AND

CLEMENT'S EPISTLES TO VIRGINS

(FIRST PRINTED 1752)

OR

THEIR GREEK VERSION NEWLY DISCOVERED IN ANTIOCHUS PALAESTINENSIS

With Appendix

CONTAINING NEWLY FOUND VERSIONS OF FRAGMENTS ATTRIBUTED TO MELITO

BY

J. M. COTTERILL

AUTHOR OF 'PEREGRINUS PROTEUS'

EDINBURGH

T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

1884

[*All Rights reserved.*]

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008

https://archive.org/details/moderncriticismc00cott

PREFACE.

—o—

THE charge now brought against modern criticism, in its relation to Clement's Epistles to Virgins and certain Fragments attributed to Melito, is simply that its exponents, though amply provided with the gifts and graces of scholarship and learning, have neglected to search for all possible evidence bearing upon the genuineness, authorship and antiquity of documents before proceeding to appeal to and expound them. If the author should be driven, in the interests of truth, to publish the remainder of his reply to the criticisms of the learned world upon *Peregrinus Proteus*,[1]—or rather upon the author's denial therein of the antiquity of Clement's Epistles to the Corinthians,—it will be necessary for him to repeat this accusation and to produce his proofs. *Modern Criticism and Clement's Epistles to the Corinthians*, when written, must necessarily have very much in common with *Modern Criticism and Clement's Epistles to Virgins*. The writer entertains a hope—a vain one, no doubt, if the past[2] is any guide as to the future—that this reply may now be unnecessary, and that critics may be induced by the following pages to consider for themselves whether the commonly received opinions concerning Clement's Epistles to the Corinthians can be upheld in the face of facts which they will have no difficulty in discovering if they will trouble themselves to look for them.

PORTOBELLO, *January* 1884.

[1] Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1879.

[2] In this connection an interesting article, with the title "Literary Forgeries," in *Contemp. Rev.*, December 1883, is very suggestive.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

INTRODUCTION, ... 1

CHAPTER I.—External Testimony, ... 3

CHAPTER II.—Modern Criticism, ... 58

CHAPTER III.—Conclusion, ... 93

APPENDIX A, ... 107

APPENDIX B, ... 115

APPENDIX C, ... 127

INTRODUCTION.

THE answers of learned criticism to *Peregrinus Proteus*, published in 1879, may be summed up under two heads. The volume, it was said, needs no real reply, because the position taken up by the writer requires that the almost universal opinion concerning Clement's Epistles to the Corinthians should be abandoned in favour of the theory that they are comparatively speaking late frauds,—a theory that cannot be maintained in the face of the fact that there are three MSS. of these Epistles of date prior to that of the alleged fraud which have been diligently examined and compared by a very sufficient scholar, who pronounces them to be everything that can be desired. In the next place, it was urged—modestly, of course, hinted rather than spoken out deliberately—that the way through the fields of early ecclesiastical literature is worn bare with the diligent feet of patient and laborious critics, and that it is therefore out of the question to suppose that anything new can have been discovered by the author of *Peregrinus Proteus* to damage in the least the credit of writings so highly esteemed as Clement's Epistles to the Corinthians, still less to prove that the learned world has fallen into an error so lamentable as to mistake somewhat modern frauds for veritable relics of antiquity. The great stumbling-block in the volume in question, was the fact that the author laid his rash hands on Clement's Epistles.

It has happened to us, while preparing a rejoinder covering the whole ground taken up by critics so far as these Epistles are concerned, to make a discovery which has a rather important bearing upon the value of the objections urged against *Peregrinus Proteus* under the second head. As this discovery could not be made known, with convenience to ourselves, in the more elaborate rejoinder of which mention has been made, it is put forth now.

The discovery was made in this wise. In Dr. Lightfoot's edition of Clement's Epistles (1869, *Appendix* 1877) there will be found on p. 9 sq.—and wherever in the following pages this learned editor's remarks are quoted without mention of the volume in which they may be found, the reference will be to this work on Clement—a long list of witnesses to the esteem in which the First Epistle to the Corinthians was held in various ages of the Church from the earliest times to the twelfth century. We have been engaged in the work of cross-questioning these several witnesses. On p. 10 Dr. Lightfoot says, "Three false Clements also, who wrote during the second century, seem to have been acquainted with the genuine Epistle. The so-called SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS offers more than one parallel to this letter (see the notes on § 11 of the Second Epistle). The EPISTLES TO VIRGINS also (see below, p. 14) seem to aim at reproducing the style of the true Clement by repeating his favourite words and expressions (see the parallels collected by Beelen, p. lx. sq.). And lastly, the EPISTLE OF CLEMENT TO JAMES, prefixed to the Clementine Homilies," etc. Farther on (p. 11) Dr. Lightfoot marks out the name of an author in an equally conspicuous manner. In this instance, however, the author is thus emphasized, in order that attention may be called to the fact that, in Dr. Lightfoot's opinion, Hilgenfeld was in error in supposing that the author named made use of Clement's Epistle, leaving the necessary inference to be drawn that the greatest possible care has been exercised both in the reception and in the exclusion of witnesses. It became our duty to examine these matters for ourselves. While doing so we discovered the oddest possible connection between the Epistles to Virgins above named and the author now referred to. It is this strange connection that we have to point out. In doing so we shall take leave to examine with care, and with more or less of completeness, the position at present assigned to these Epistles among the remains of ecclesiastical antiquity by the learned world. At the same time, a great many matters will be passed by which would need discussion if the present volume was intended to be, as it is not, a new edition of the Epistles to Virgins.

CHAPTER I.

External Testimony.

The Epistles to Virgins are found in one MS. only, which is thus described by Dr. Lightfoot (p. 15):—

"It forms the second volume of a copy of the Syriac New Testament, bears the date 1781 (*i.e.* A.D. 1470), and was brought to Europe from Aleppo in the last century. It was written in Syriac and Carshunic, and includes other books of the New Testament besides those which have a place in the Peshito Canon. After the books comprised in this Canon, of which the Epistle to the Hebrews stands last, the scribe has added a doxology, and a long account of himself and the circumstances under which the MS. was written. Then follow in the same handwriting 2 Peter, 2, 3 John, and Jude, from the Philoxenian version, and immediately after these in succession, '*The First Epistle of the blessed Clement, the disciple of Peter the Apostle*,' and '*The Second Epistle of the same Clement.*' Thus the two Epistles on Virginity hold the same position in this late Syrian copy which is held by the two Epistles to the Corinthians in the ancient Greek MS." (Codex Alexandrinus).

From the quasi-canonical position which these Epistles here occupy, it must be intended that we should infer that they were read in the churches, as Eusebius tells us was the case with the first of the two Epistles to the Corinthians. In the Syriac MS. known as S (A.D. 1170, exactly 300 years before that just described), the last-named Epistles are found in a position of "absolute equality with the canonical writings" (Light. p. 237).

Out of this late MS. (A.D. 1470) the Epistles to Virgins were printed by Wetstein in 1752 as the genuine works of Clement of Rome. "They have found champions also," Dr. Lightfoot says (p. 15), "in their two latest editors, Villecourt (Paris 1853), whose preface and translation are reprinted

with the text in Migne's *Patrologia*, i. p. 350 sq., and Beelen (Louvain 1856), whose edition is in all respects the most complete: and other Roman Catholic divines have in like manner held them to be genuine." Since Dr. Lightfoot wrote they have been edited by Funk, *Op. Patr. Apost.* vol. ii. (Tubingæ 1881), in an improved translation, but without the text. This last edition tells all that is known concerning them, but adds almost nothing to previous information. Indeed, all that has been discovered during the 130 years that they have been in print is the fact, accidentally ascertained by Cureton (*Corp. Ignat.* pp. 212, 244, 354), that a Syriac MS. contains a passage quoted by Timotheus of Alexandria as from The First Epistle on Virginity by Clement bishop of Rome. This passage has one answering to it pretty nearly in *Ep.* i. 6. Epiphanius and Jerome say that Clement wrote letters in which he taught virginity. It has therefore been assumed that the Epistles to Virgins are those Letters with which Epiphanius and Jerome were acquainted. This assumption is supposed to be confirmed by the quotation which Cureton discovered in 1849. With the exception of this quotation, the evidence has been the very same for all critics from the earliest to the latest. They are, however, divided in opinion as to the authorship and date of the Epistles. Prejudice has had a good deal to do with this conflict of opinion, for while the teaching of these letters on virginity has been a stumbling-block to some critics, it has been that which has specially commended them to the favourable opinion of others.

In dealing with these Epistles it will be convenient, in the first instance, to examine the external testimony, then to review the internal features on which critics have relied to prove the author, date, and country to which they ought to be assigned, and, finally, to make such further observations as occasion may require.

The external testimony will be now discussed. Funk, as the latest editor, ought to be credited with having sifted to the bottom every shred of evidence advanced under this head. He gives, however, in his *Prolegomena* (p. ii.) a piece of information which is little short of astounding. He says "Denique notandum est, epistulas in ecclesia syriaca etiam

medio ævo lectas fuisse. Ign. Ant. Samhiri, patriarcha Antiochiæ, anno 1855 I. Theodoro Beelen literis communicavit, eas omnibus scriptoribus Syris tam antiquioribus quam recentioribus notas esse, veluti Gregorio Bar-Hebræo, Moysi Bar-Cepha, Georgio, Dionysio Bar-Salibi et ceteris." So then the Epistles were known to all Syrian writers, both ancient and modern, and there must be, one would suppose, in those regions a perfect wealth of MSS. of all ages; and yet Funk in 1881, twenty-six years after this fact was ascertained, is not able to produce one new MS., one new quotation, one new description by which the Epistles now in our hands can be identified, or one new fact. We are wrong; there is possibly one. In a note to "ceteris" he writes "Cf. Beelen, *l.c.* p. liv. sqq. Dionysius Bar-Salibi (sæc. xii.) inprimis mentionem facit epistulæ Clementis Rom. adversus eos, qui matrimonium rejiciunt. Cf. Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* ii. p. 158." This quotation is not a new discovery, but the application of it may possibly be. We are troubled to know the reason for the note. Does the editor mean the quotation to be in some sort an identification of our Epistles with that named by Bar-Salibi? If so, the following is the highest praise of marriage to be found in the Epistles. In *Ep.* i. 4, the writer says that they who decline the command to "increase and multiply," and set their desires on the hope promised and laid up in heaven by God, shall have a place in His house more excellent than those "qui in casto vixerint connubio et quorum *torus* fuerit *immaculatus*." Language of this kind hardly seems to satisfy the terms of the quotation produced by Funk, if he intends it as a mark of identification of our Epistles with those known to Bar-Salibi. But if this is not the object of the note, why is it given without any comment? The quotation obviously suggests that Bar-Salibi had no knowledge of our Epistles, and that the other writers named by Funk had no more knowledge than Bar-Salibi. This is confirmed by the fact that the "communication" of which Funk makes so much has led to no new MSS., to nothing, in short, that can throw light upon the Epistles. On Bar-Salibi's statement, however, Dr. Lightfoot (writing in 1869) casts a certain light. Speaking of the various letters under the name of Clement, some still extant and some

lost, he says (p. 22) "The Epistle of Clement, to which Dionysius Barsalibi alludes as written against those who reject matrimony (so he is reported by Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* ii. p. 158), may have been one of these (lost letters); but as the First Epistle to James urges very strongly the importance of early marriages (§ 7), I am disposed to think that he referred to this." The testimony of all Syrian writers, both ancient and modern, seemingly amounts to nothing.

The matter would indeed not have been worth noticing at all if Funk's action were not in some sort typical of the rash and hasty way in which external testimony to documents is too commonly provided. Here is an A.D. 1470 MS.—like the celebrated phœnix, "sole of its kind"—which contains Epistles of Clement. It is in Syriac. It is reported that Syrian writers speak of Epistles of Clement. It is at once assumed that the Epistles are the same. The testimony is transferred to the *Prolegomena*, and duly marshalled along with whatever else can be scraped together. It was an important addition, doubtless, a whole armful of writers of all ages added to the three (only) other testimonies. Testimonies should be weighed, not counted, as the manner of some is.

The foregoing remarks apply with hardly less force to other testimonies which have to be examined, namely, those of Epiphanius and Jerome. In 1752 Wetstein printed the Epistles of Virgins, concluding them to be the genuine works of Clement bishop of Rome. Let us think calmly for a moment as to the real meaning of that which he did.

There are found in Migne's edition of the works of Clement —Epistolæ ad Corinthios 2, Epistolæ Decretales 5, Constitutiones Apostolicæ 8 (a considerable volume), Recognitiones 10 (do.), Epistola Clementis ad Jacobum, Homiliæ 24 (again a considerable volume), Epitome de gestis S. Petri, Liturgia. Of this vast mass of documents under the name of Clement one only, the First Epistle to the Corinthians, is commonly counted genuine. While in the full knowledge of these circumstances, some fresh claimants to Clementine honours came into Wetstein's hands in the shape of two Epistles. The MS. containing them was dated as late as A.D. 1470. The Epistles were on virginity. He turned to Eusebius, the first authority in such matters, and found no mention of them.

He turned next to Jerome, and found that this the second great authority speaks, like Philip of old, with an uncertain voice. When Jerome soberly discusses Clement and his writings, he is as silent as Eusebius as to these new Epistles; but in a certain work against Jovinianus, he mentions two Epistles under the name of Clement, nearly the whole teaching of which is, he says, upon virginity. Wetstein cast about for further information, and found that Epiphanius mentions two Epistles in which, he says, Clement teaches virginity, and speaks of prophets,—a description which applies to the Epistles to Virgins. But Wetstein found also that Epiphanius describes the Epistles as read in the churches,—a curious fact, since the only Clementine Letter elsewhere so described is the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Wetstein's A.D. 1470 MS., however, from the position assigned in it to the Epistles to Virgins, leaves it to be inferred that at that time, that is to say, one thousand years and more after the times of Epiphanius, they were so read. Having possessed himself of this evidence, which told just as much against the Epistles to Virgins as in their favour, Wetstein then and there, without taking any trouble to examine the matter more completely, printed the Epistles as the genuine writings of Clement of Rome, citing Epiphanius and Jerome as witnesses to their authenticity. If lawyers and bank-clerks acted in this reckless way, forgery would be the very best of trades.

From Wetstein the Epistles passed into the hands of the learned world. Editors and critics commented upon them; they followed in his wake, and duly cited Epiphanius and Jerome; they pressed the Epistles into the service of the Church, and pointed to quotations in them as the earliest instances of the use of certain Epistles of the New Testament; they used them to illustrate church life in the second century. And all alike were studious in their imitation of Wetstein's want of diligence and recklessness of belief. No one of them all, from first to last, for whatever purpose he wanted to use these Epistles, ever attempted to find out anything more about them than he could gather by the cheap and easy process of reading them through, and comparing comments made upon them by preceding critics as little diligent as himself. We are simply describing facts. There is not the smallest diffi-

culty in finding what may be fairly called a Greek version of the greater part of these Epistles to Virgins.

Dr. Lightfoot, it will be remembered, claims the author of these Epistles as a witness in the second century to Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians. He thinks that this writer imitated the genuine Clement's expressions. In other words, Dr. Lightfoot concludes that the genuine Epistle left a reliable mark of use upon the literature of the second century. The principle is a reasonable one, and one upon which we put a high value. Any writing which has a great currency will leave its mark upon succeeding literature. A little caution, however, is necessary, lest the hand of the copyist should be mistaken for the original author, for a late author must of necessity be influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by the authors who precede him. In the same place as the writer of the Epistles to Virgins is claimed by Dr. Lightfoot as a witness to Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, this editor says "Early in the third century PETER OF ALEXANDRIA in his account of the Apostles Peter and Paul treads closely in the footsteps of Clement (§ 5)." The same principle as before is here applied. This application reminds us that, if further light is desired upon a document which is in great measure unknown, it is an excellent plan to take, as a starting-point, any noteworthy statement that that document may contain respecting persons such as the Apostles Peter and Paul and others. If we do this with the Epistles to Virgins a great light upon them may immediately be found. In *Ep.* i. 6 are noticeable statements concerning John Baptist, John the beloved disciple, Paul, Barnabas, Timothy, Elias, and Elisha. These statements are prefaced by the quotation which Cureton found in his Syriac MS. Taking this as a starting-point, we may reach all we want to find in several different ways. Since Funk's edition has been in our hands, which we obtained when we wanted to know whether he had made the same discovery as ourselves, we have observed a very interesting sequence of references which will take our readers to the Greek original of *Ep.* i. 6. On the statements respecting John Baptist, etc., Funk refers us to "pseudo-Ignat. *ad Philad.* 4." Turning, still in this editor's volume, to *Philad.* 4, we find some statements (*e.g.* as to Timothy) corresponding to those in

the Epistle, and one concerning S. Paul which is contradictory. On this Funk quotes a note of Cotelier's. Turning to Cotelier (*Patr. Apost.* ii. *Philad.* 4) we find this note upon S. Paul, and, a little above it, another on Timothy, which refers the reader to Antiochus *Hom.* 112, and yet another note on Elias (also named in *Ep.* i. 6), which refers to Antiochus *Hom.* 21. In these two homilies *Ep.* i. 6 will be found. So then if Funk had expended a little diligence upon the authorities to which he refers his readers, he would have saved himself the trouble of entirely rewriting his edition of the Epistles to Virgins, which he must do if it is to be of the smallest value. Antiochus Palæstinensis is, however, the author referred to above (p. 2), as placed in Dr. Lightfoot's *Veterum Testimonia* to Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians, along with the author of the Epistles to Virgins, the one because he is not, and the other because he is a reliable witness. Yet the one is the *alter ego* of the other. A more delightful example of incuriousness could not easily be found. The question whether Antiochus copied from the Greek version of our Epistles, or the author of these Epistles from Antiochus, does not affect this fact. In either case the incuriousness is the same. The external testimony, therefore, must be enriched by the addition of the name of Antiochus Palæstinensis.

These things have been pointed out plainly, perhaps sharply, because it is necessary to make it evident at the outset that the Epistles to Virgins have been admitted to their place in the ranks of antiquity, and diligently discussed, without any pains whatever having been taken to find the evidence by which that position can be ascertained with any certainty.

In proceeding to examine the statements of Epiphanius and Jerome—to cross-question these witnesses, so to say—attention must be directed to a point which apparently has been overlooked. If the Epistles to Virgins were in the style of the Apostolic Constitutions or of the Clementine Homilies, there would be at once a reason for supposing that they belonged to the same family, and so an *à priori* argument for concluding that Epiphanius and Jerome, when they mention Epistles of Clement that teach virginity, refer to those in our hands. If, again, these Epistles were in the style of the Forged Decretals, an *à priori* argument would lie that they

can be no earlier than the times of these later forgeries. But the author of these Epistles is separated by a yawning gulf from the authors of the earlier and later forgeries alike. His letters are nearer, far nearer, to the First Epistle to the Corinthians than to any other of the Clementine writings. His Epistles resemble that to the Corinthians in the absence of the characteristic "Ego Clemens;" in the impartiality shown in dealings with SS. Peter and Paul; in the, generally speaking, moderation of statement; for if there are one or two extravagances in the one, so also are there in the other. But the general resemblance is certainly not so close as to suggest a common authorship. What should a critic do in such a case? Certainly he will not content himself with reading the Epistles through once or twice, and with trying to determine the date out of the contents, for this would be only to deliver himself into the power of the author who, if not Clement, is a forger who will probably have laid traps for the feet of the unwary. A critic who is worthy of the name will, in our opinion, in a case like this suspend his judgment until he knows somewhat more. He will examine the language of Epiphanius and Jerome without prejudice or favour, and while he carefully notes the way in which the language of these Fathers, in their descriptions of the Epistles known to them, corresponds with our Epistles, he will consider also whether there is anything which these witnesses might, under the circumstances, be fairly expected to have said, but have not said. He will consider, in short, whether there is, or is not, anything to give rise to a surmise that the writer of the Epistles had his eyes on Epiphanius and Jerome. Knowing that he has to do with one of a host of writings under Clement's name, all but one of which are allowed on almost all hands to be spurious, he will, in the case of these Epistles, assume neither truth nor falsehood, but simply carry into his investigations those principles of common caution which prevail in courts of law, and indeed in all transactions between man and man in common life.

Some of our readers may perhaps ask here whether there is any proved instance in which a *falsarius* has deliberately taken words from an ancient author which, when found in his own writing, might lead the unwary reader to ascribe a false

date to that writing. We might answer that Dr. Lightfoot's contention that the author of these very Epistles to Virgins imitated the expressions of the genuine Clement concedes the whole question. But we have a sufficient illustration at hand, one well known in the learned world, though at present but little heeded. In *Corp. Ignat.* p. 340 Cureton points out that pseudo-Ignatius begins his Letter to the Antiochians in the words of another Letter, also to the Antiochians, but by Alexander of Jerusalem. The words of Alexander are preserved by Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 11). An attentive reader will see proofs in Eusebius' context that pseudo-Ignatius suffered his eyes to rest too long upon the neighbourhood in which he found Alexander's opening words. It is needless to produce these, for it is allowed on all hands that the contents of the Letter prove that its writer was the copyist. But if he had only made the rest of the Letter answerable to the beginning, the coincidence of language with Alexander would be quoted to-day by critics as an unanswerable proof of genuineness. Alexander, it would be said, as was natural, addressed the Church at Antioch in the language of its own dearly beloved Ignatius, while the genuineness of the Letter of Alexander, it would be added, is guaranteed by the authority of Eusebius. But the Letter in question would be none the less a forgery. Will any one be so simple as to believe that that kind of forger's device began and ended with pseudo-Ignatius, or as not to see that the quotations and allusions scattered up and down the pages of Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome, and other authors may be like fingerposts to the literary forger, directing him perhaps to a title to his work, or else to ways and means of giving verisimilitude to that work. A *falsarius* cannot otherwise be met than by the exercise of that reasonable suspicion by which frauds in common life are detected.

The Epistles to Virgins may have been written by a *falsarius*, consequently a critic is bound, that is, if he would be safe, to scrutinize the supposed testimonies to them in the pages of Epiphanius and Jerome with as much care as if he was quite sure that the writer of the Epistles was of that stamp. Wetstein did not take this course, which common sense suggests, and though one hundred and thirty years have passed by since he printed them, the work has still to be done.

The language of Epiphanius is as follows:—

"Sunt et alii libri quibus utuntur, velut *Petri Circuitus* a Clemente conscripti (ταῖς διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφείσαις), quo in libro paucis veris relictis cætera supposuerunt: quemadmodum Clemens ipse omnibus illos modis redarguit iis *Epistolis circularibus* (ἐπιστολῶν ἐγκυκλίων), quæ ab eo scriptæ in sacrosanctis ecclesiis leguntur. Ex quibus constat longe ab iis quæ in *Circuitibus* (περιόδοις), illis sub ejus nomine adulterina exstant, illius fidem ac sermonem abhorruisse. Etenim virginitatem Clemens edocuit, isti repudiant: ille Eliam Davidem et Sampsonem omnesque prophetas commendat (ἐγκωμιάζει); Ebionitæ detestantur. Quare in *Circuitibus* istis suum ad institutum accommodarunt omnia, ac de Petro plurima mendacia confinxerunt. Cujusmodi est inter cætera, quotidie illum castimoniæ causa lavisse, quod isti facere consueverunt. Tum ab animatis omnibus et carnibus, reliquoque omni, quod carne constet abstinuisse," etc.—*Hær.* xxx. 15, p. 139.

The words of Jerome are these:—

"Simulque tractanda sententia: *Qui se*, inquit, *castraverunt propter regna cœlorum. . . . Qui potest*, inquit, *capere, capiat.* Grandis fidei est, grandisque virtutes, Dei templum esse purissimum, totum se holocaustum offerre Domino; et juxta eumdem Apostolum, esse sanctum et corpore et spiritu. Hi sunt eunuchi, qui se lignum aridum ob sterilitatem putantes, audiunt per Isaiam (lvi. 4, 5), quod pro filiis et filiabus locum in cœlis habeant paratum. Horum typus est . . . et spado ille reginæ Candacis in Actis Apostolorum, qui ob robur fidei, viri nomen obtinuit. Ad hos et Clemens successor Apostoli Petri, cujus Paulus Apostolus meminit, scribit Epistolas, omnemque pene sermonem suum de virginitatis puritate contexit." —*Adv. Jovin.* i. 12, p. 258.

The Epistles to Virgins as they stand in the MS. answer *exactly* to the statements of Epiphanius and Jerome.

The First Epistle is headed "Epistula Prior Beati Clementis Discipuli Petri (Jerome) Apostoli." It begins thus:—

"Omnibus (Epiphanius' encyclical letters) . . . [fratribus] virginibus beatis, qui dedunt se servandæ virginitati *propter regnum cœlorum* (Jerome), et [sororibus] virginibus sacris ea quæ in Deo est pax. Unicuique virginum [fratrum aut sororum], qui vere statuerunt servare virginitatem *propter regnum cœlorum* (Jerome), necessarium est cœlorum regno usquequaque dignum esse. Neque enim aut eloquentia aut fama, aut conditione et prosapia, aut formositate aut robore aut diuturno tempore regnum cœlorum obtinetur; verum obtinetur illud fidei (see Jerome) efficacia, ubi quis opera fidei ostendit. Scilicet qui revera pius est, ejus opera de fide ipsius testantur, quod verus sit fidelis, fide magna, fide perfecta, fide in Deo, fide quæ *luceat in bonis operibus*, ut omnium *pater* per Christum *glorificetur*."

Isa. lvi. 4, 5 is used in i. 4, as Funk points out, followed immediately by the use of 1 Cor. vii. 34 *sollicita est, quomodo possit Domino suo placere casto corpore et spiritu* which in Jerome precedes Isa. lvi. 4, 5.

With Epiphanius the author speaks of Elias in i. 6, of David in ii. 10, of Samson in ii. 9, and lumps together (Micham) omnesque prophetas in ii. 14; he tells no lies about S. Peter, for he does not mention the apostle's name in the body of the Epistles; he speaks of washing, but, save of the feet, makes no point of it; he mentions as food, bread and water, but adds "aut id, quod Deus præparaverit."

The Epistles are found in the Syriac MS. of 1470 in the same quasi-canonical position as Clement's Epistles to the Corinthians in the Codex Alexandrinus (*vid. sup.* p. 3). The inference is that they were at one time read in the holy churches, as Epiphanius declares.

The one subject from beginning to the extreme end is on virginity, as Jerome informs us. They close with "Quod superest, valete in Domino et *gaudete in Domino* omnes sancti," etc., showing that from first to last they are encyclical letters, according to the statement of Epiphanius. Last of all, the eye of the reader rests on "Explicit epistula secunda Clementis discipuli Petri" (Jerome). Nor should it be forgotten that the text which Jerome glances at when he says "*Cujus Paulus Apostolus meminit*" is used in *Ep.* i. 6 "Paulus . . . cum reliquis aliis *quorum nomina scripta sunt in libro vitæ*," where the apostle's compliment is gracefully returned (*vid. inf.* p. 30).

There can be no question here as to the fact that the language of Epiphanius and Jerome, taken together, very accurately describes the contents of these Epistles to Virgins. It might be called a succinct summary of their contents. The exceeding accuracy of it is quite surprising. Can anything be more curious than to find that the praise which Epiphanius says that Clement bestowed upon "all the prophets," amounts to no more than the repetition of the phrase "omnesque prophetas"? We are aware that an attempt is made sometimes to water down the meaning of ἐγκωμιάζει, but the attempt shows a difficulty, and that the word has to be explained by the contents of the Epistles, not

by its customary usage. As one reads the language and context of both Fathers, and compares them with the Epistles as they stand in the MS., it is difficult to escape from the feeling that these documents, so to speak, protest too loudly their authenticity.

1. The language of Epiphanius must, however, be examined more closely.

There is a difficulty in the way of accepting our Epistles as those known to this Father, which, so far as we have observed, has never been pointed out, however much it may have been felt, and from which we see no way of escape. The persons against whom Epiphanius, in the passage quoted above, was contending were the Ebionites. They did not admit virginity, and they abominated the prophets, and they used books under the name of Clement to support their errors. Epiphanius turned against them their own chosen authority. Clement, he said, in acknowledged books taught virginity and praised all the prophets. So far well; but if there was one thing for which, above all, the Ebionites were notorious it was their hatred of S. Paul and his Epistles. How then does it come to pass that Epiphanius does not here throw in at least the name of S. Paul along with the prophets even if he added nothing more? The commendation bestowed upon S. Paul by our writer in *Ep.* i. 6 is greater than that upon all the prophets. Besides, as Dr. Westcott points out (*Canon* p. 183 sq.), our writer quotes all or nearly all the Epistles of S. Paul. It would have been easy for Epiphanius to have added "Paul and all his Epistles." It cannot be urged that Epiphanius had not this hatred of the Ebionites in his mind at the time of writing, because he had. He could not speak of more than one thing at a time, but as soon as ever he had finished the special point in hand, at the bottom of the very same column in Migne (§ 16, p. 140), he begins upon the scurrilous animosity entertained by the Ebionites against the Apostle Paul. We cannot suppose that Epiphanius thought it to be less a fault to reject S. Paul and half the books of the New Testament, than to reject virginity and the prophets of the Old Testament. Yet if he was acquainted with our Epistles he quoted their authority against the lesser error but not against

the greater, though at the moment of writing the one error was as much in his mind as the other. We suppose every one must admit that the natural inference to be drawn from this fact is that Epiphanius had no knowledge of our Epistles, and that the resemblance which is seen between his language and our Epistles must have some other explanation than that he knew them. It may be urged, indeed, that Epiphanius does not quote Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians against the Ebionites. This is true of course, but then the reason for his not doing so is clear and sufficient, and the same which we have suggested as his reason for not quoting our Epistles against them in the case of S. Paul. He had no first-hand knowledge of the Epistles to the Corinthians. In *Hær.* xxvii. 6 (p. 107) he quotes indeed a few words which he says could be found in one of Clement's Epistles (*ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν αὐτοῦ*), but he is careful to add that he found the passage in some collection of excerpts (*ἔν τισιν ὑπομνηματισμοῖς*. See Light. p. 16). The expression "in one of his Epistles" suggests that Epiphanius recognised the currency of more than one Clementine Letter. In the passage under consideration he recognises the currency of more than one. Why should they not be the same Epistles? Epiphanius, it will be said in reply, in *Hær.* xxvii. 6, must refer to the First Epistle to the Corinthians, since the words which he quotes as from Clement have some resemblance to a passage in the Epistle; while the description given of the Epistles mentioned in *Hær.* xxx. 15—the teaching on virginity, the praising of at least Samson and all the prophets—does not apply to the Epistle to the Corinthians. If this fact be insisted upon, it will be found to be so much the worse for this Epistle. But there is no occasion to insist upon it, for if from his want of personal acquaintance with this Epistle Epiphanius was "vague and loose" in the one case, much more would he be likely to be vague and even wrong in the other, where he does not attempt to quote anything. He was dependent for his knowledge upon hearsay, or, at best, upon memoranda which were very far from accurate, if the First Epistle to the Corinthians now in our hands is genuine.

It may again be objected to our theory that the Epistles

mentioned by Epiphanius were in both cases the Epistles to the Corinthians—that he could hardly fail to know that the Second Epistle was not universally received as from the pen of the Roman bishop, and that consequently he could not, when arguing against the Ebionites, speak as if there were more than one Clementine Letter. It is clear, however, from his language that this is just what he would do, always supposing that the two Epistles mentioned by Eusebius, the one as genuine the other as spurious, were associated together in his times. Various reasons might be given for supposing that this was so. Two only need be given, but they are the reasons which must have greatest weight with our readers. First in the Codex Alexandrinus (of the fifth century) the two Epistles are found together. Secondly, in his examination of the three MSS. of the Epistles, Dr. Lightfoot considers that he has satisfactorily proved that these three survivors of the multitude of copies once in circulation have been derived (*mirabile dictu!*) from one archetypal[1] MS., "not later, or not much later, than the close of the second century," and that in that ancient MS. the two Epistles to the Corinthians stood side by side. If, then, in these early times they were thus associated, they would commonly be known as Clement's Epistles; and Epiphanius would cite them both as such, even if he doubted of the authenticity of one, because here, in the passage before us, he speaks of the books used by the Ebionites as written by Clement—ταῖς διὰ Κλήμεντος γραφείσαις. We shall see presently that Jerome did the very same thing, and with the very same books (*vid. inf.* p. 22).

Before passing to the second great objection to the notion that Epiphanius must in his language, in the passage above quoted, be referring to the Epistles to Virgins, we ought perhaps to take notice of the expression Ἐπιστολῶν ἐγκυκλίων. In the days before the printing of our Epistles, the whole passage was commonly taken to refer to the two

[1] In referring to Dr. Lightfoot's theory and presently to the MSS., we follow the example of some of the ancient Fathers, who were wont at times to appeal to the fabulous story of the phœnix, and to the fictions of heathen mythology, not because they themselves believed in them, but because such things were recognised facts of first importance in the minds of those whom these Fathers addressed. Any reasons of our own would seem weak as compared with those advanced in the text.

Epistles to the Corinthians, and but little difficulty if any was felt as to the word ἐγκύκλιος as applied to them. Cotelier, for example, boldly places Epiphanius in his *Veterum Testimonia*, quoting out of each of the passages referred to above. To-day critics are delighted to press the technical meaning of the word, because the value of Epiphanius' description seems to be thereby enhanced. The use, however, of the word ἐγκύκλιος here by Epiphanius, instead of being an objection to our view, goes a long way towards identifying the Epistles named by him with the Epistles to the Corinthians. Epiphanius gives the title of the Clementine work used by the Ebionites, but not that of the Clementine Epistles. If he had called them the Epistles to Virgins, or on Virginity, the title would have told its own tale, and he would have had no occasion to add the obvious fact that Clement taught virginity. The title again would have informed them that the Letters were not to be thought of as if applicable to some particular Church only. If the Epistles mentioned were our Epistles, there was no need to withhold the title. If they were the Epistles to the Corinthians, there was a sufficient reason for a change. By the use of the word ἐγκύκλιος, Epiphanius would remind the Ebionites that the Epistles had become ἐγκύκλιοι by common usage, and therefore it was that he added τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἁγίαις ἐκκλησίαις ἀναγινωσκομένων by way of explanation.

In the words just quoted—"read in the holy churches"—there lies an objection to the supposition that Epiphanius in his language refers to our Epistles, that no critic has been able to explain away.[1] Eusebius and after him Jerome inform us that the First Epistle to the Corinthians was so read; but there is no other Clementine Letter of which this is said. We can understand that Epiphanius, if he had no personal knowledge of the Epistles to the Corinthians, and if they were associated together at that time in the same volume and in men's mouths, might speak of the two as read in the

[1] Dr. Lightfoot feels the difficulty, but sees in it only the fitting opportunity for the exercise of an expositor's skill. "The reading would probably be confined to a few congregations in Syria and Palestine. But it is possible that he carelessly repeats a notice which he had read elsewhere, and which in his original authority referred not to these, but to the two Epistles to the Corinthians."—P. 17.

churches, or that it might be even strictly true that the two Epistles had become so closely connected together that they were even so read. But it seems impossible to believe that his statement should be true of any other Epistles, while still no mention of such a practice can be found. It must be observed that no appeal lies here to the 1470 MS., although, as has been pointed out above, in this MS. the position of the Epistles suggests that a thousand years after Epiphanius' time they were so read. There is no appeal, for a reason that the most of our readers will accept: the Syriac MS. known as S, dated A.D. 1170, and therefore earlier by 300 years, shows that both the Epistles to the Corinthians were read in church, and even supplies the lectionary that was used. Then in Cod. Alex. (fifth century, or 900 years earlier) the Epistles to the Corinthians hold exactly the same position as the Epistles to Virgins in the A.D. 1470 MS. The theory, therefore, that the Epistles to the Corinthians were both of them read in church in Epiphanius' day has evidence in support of it which is absolutely overwhelming as compared with anything that can be urged in favour of the Epistles to Virgins. The expression, therefore, "read in the churches," must be held to describe the Epistles to the Corinthians. We do not, however, think that the words "read in the churches" need be pressed so rigorously as to apply to the one Epistle as much as to the other. The two Epistles to the Corinthians were associated together, they were both called by the name of Clement; and in course of time this association produced its natural result, and they were both alike concluded to be from his pen. Epiphanius might well speak of the two as men usually spoke, without meaning to pledge his credit that what was exactly true of one was equally true of the other.

The examination of the language of Epiphanius (*Hær.* xxx. 15) thus leads us to conclude that this Father had no knowledge of the Epistles to Virgins now in our hands, but refers to the Epistles to the Corinthians, to which he also refers elsewhere. This conclusion is supported by the fact that he describes these Epistles as ἐγκύκλιοι, which again he explains by the further description that they were "read in the holy churches."

2. The language of Jerome has now to be considered (*vid. sup.* p. 12). This will be sufficiently recalled to memory by the following words:—"To Jerome also these Epistles were known. He must be referring to them when he writes (*adv. Jovin.* i. 12, ii. p. 257), 'Ad hos (*i.e.* eunuchos) et Clemens successor Apostoli Petri, cujus Paulus Apostolus meminit, scribit epistolas, *omnemque fere sermonem suum de virginitatis puritate contexit*'" (Light. p. 16). The italics show that Dr. Lightfoot was caught by the accuracy of the description. Why Jerome did not give the title for the information of his readers and of posterity, and which would have made the description unnecessary, Dr. Lightfoot does not say. Of course, if Jerome was referring to the well-known (at least by reputation) Epistles to the Corinthians, the reason for omitting the title and giving the description is self-evident. Dr. Lightfoot proceeds—and, in view of the fact that he is *assuming* the antiquity of our Epistles in simple reliance upon the remarks of Epiphanius and Jerome concerning untitled Clementine Letters, in singularly euphemistic language—thus:—

> On the other hand, it is strange that in his Catalogue of Christian Writers (§ 15) he mentions only the two Epistles to the Corinthians. Here, indeed, as in other parts of this treatise, he copies Eusebius implicitly; but as he proffers his own opinion ("quæ *mihi* videtur") of the resemblance between the First Epistle of Clement and the Epistle to the Hebrews (though even this opinion exactly coincides with the statement of Eusebius), and as moreover in several other passages he quotes from the genuine letter (*in Is.* lii. 13, iv. p. 612; *ad Ephes.* ii. 2, vii. p. 571; *ad Ephes.* iv. 1, vii. p. 606), it is most probable that he had himself read it. The quotations, if they had stood alone, he might possibly have borrowed from earlier commentators.
>
> Epiphanius was intimately connected with Syria and Palestine, and Jerome spent some time there. Both these fathers therefore would have means of acquainting themselves with books circulated in these Churches. As regards the latter, we must suppose that he first became acquainted with the Epistles to Virgins in the not very long interval between the publication of the Catalogue and of the work against Jovinianus; and, as this interval was spent at Bethlehem, the supposition is reasonable. The alternative is, that in writing against Jovinianus he for polemical purposes assumed the genuineness of these Clementine letters, which he had silently ignored a year or two before.—P. 16 sq.

A *falsarius* would desire nothing so much for the success of his *fictum pro antiquo* as that it should pass

into the hands of a learned man possessed of a belief in its antiquity. The fact that his learning can supply an answer to a difficulty will the more persuade him that the work is ancient. If his eyes are not blinded by the *falsarius*, he will effectually blind them for himself. A man of less learning would in this case say that the difficulty pointed out is one to be fairly met and examined, and not to be jauntily dismissed with a solution which, if true, admits of the easiest verification. But to the school of criticism to which this critic belongs a difficulty of this kind only means something for learning to explain away. No objection can be fairly taken to these remarks, inasmuch as the silence of Jerome in his Catalogue, so far from being the only circumstance which tells against the Epistles to Virgins, is only of a piece with the difficulties with which the whole external testimony bristles. Eusebius, who, if any one, should have known something of these Epistles, is quite silent. Epiphanius, if in one part of his remarks he seems to describe them, in another part, when he says that they were read in the churches, seems rather to have the Epistles to the Corinthians in view. The MS. in which alone the Epistles are found is as late as A.D. 1470. The difficulty, therefore, which is caused by the silence of Jerome in his Catalogue is substantial. Under these circumstances one would have expected that Dr. Lightfoot, in giving his proposed solution, would have added at least one short sentence to say that he had carefully examined the writings of Jerome with a view to the verification of his conjecture, and that his readers might rely upon it that nothing could be found in these writings, and specially in those written prior to the Catalogue, to militate against his proposed solution of the difficulty. But Dr. Lightfoot does not venture on any such assurance.

Now, if Dr. Lightfoot had examined Jerome's work against Jovinianus he would have found that, whilst Jerome is supposed in § 12 to mention the Epistles to Virgins, in § 26 (*vid. inf.* p. 30) he refers Jovinianus expressly to the Catalogue (§ 9) which, as Dr. Lightfoot points out, discusses the Epistles of Clement in § 15, without mention of the Epistles to Virgins. This fact effectually disposes of Dr. Lightfoot's solution. For even if we suppose Jerome to have been a knave, as we must

if we adopt Dr. Lightfoot's alternative, no one will believe that he was such a downright simpleton as to refer Jovinianus and all other readers to the very book, and to the very part of that book, which would at once expose his duplicity. It must be further observed that in the very section in which Jerome refers to the Catalogue he quotes (*vid. inf.* p. 29 sq.) the *Περίοδοι*, the book mentioned by Epiphanius (*vid. sup.* p. 12). Thus, then, while in the act of referring to the Catalogue, he had in his mind writings current in the Church under the name of Clement. Under such circumstances it was impossible for him to forget that he had shortly before appealed to certain Epistles of Clement as of authority against the teaching of Jovinianus. It seems therefore incredible that the Clementine Letters appealed to were the Epistles to Virgins, unless a further charge of thorough-going literary rascality be brought against Jerome, which no one is justified in making against such a conspicuous Father in the Church, unless he can at the same time give the plainest evidence of its truth.

There is no description of the contents of the Clementine Letters mentioned by Jerome in his Catalogue. One of them was addressed, he says, to the Church at Corinth, and the language bore some resemblance to the Epistle to the Hebrews. But what the subject of this Epistle was he does not say. He says further that there was a second Epistle, but that it was rejected by the ancients. It has been pointed out above (p. 16), and what was said there need not be repeated, that these two Epistles were commonly known in the Church as Clement's Epistles. They were associated together, and spoken of together, while still one only was reckoned as genuine. Just as Dr. Lightfoot has "the Epistles of S. Clement" both inside and outside his edition, or as Dr. Jacobson has "S. Clementis Romani, S. Ignatii, S. Polycarpi Patrum Apostolicorum Quæ Supersunt," and even "S. Clementis Epistola II.," while still both these editors deny that the Second Epistle was written by Clement. It is doubtful, as Dr. Lightfoot allows, whether Jerome had any personal knowledge of these Epistles, and it is highly improbable that the readers of his work against Jovinianus had as much knowledge of them even as Jerome. What

other conclusion then could they draw from his appeal in that work to Epistles of Clement followed presently by a reference (without explanation) to the Catalogue in which the Epistles of Clement are described, than that the Epistles were the same? It is no objection to this that in the Catalogue the Second Epistle is rejected. The *Περίοδοι* was spoken of by Epiphanius as "written by Clement," and though Jerome does not in *adv. Jovin.* 26 give Clement's name, yet in *adv. Galat.* i. 18 (p. 394), speaking of S. Peter, he says, "an (ut Clemens in Periodis ejus refert) calvitiem haberet in capite." He does not thereby recognise the book as Clement's genuine work. He gives the statement for what it was worth, using the name of Clement as every one else did. The book itself would seem to be the same as the "Disputatio Petri et Appionis longo sermone conscripta," which Jerome, taking the title from Eusebius, expressly rejects from among Clement's genuine works. The readers of Jerome's work against Jovinianus, unless far better informed than we have any reason for supposing, could not fail to conclude that the Epistles named in that work were the Epistles described in the Catalogue.

Now it may be said that this was exactly what Jerome desired; that he first of all appealed to the Epistles to Virgins as Clement's well knowing them to be spurious, and then deliberately referred his readers to the Catalogue, that they might conclude, if their eyes chanced to turn in that direction as they could hardly fail to do, from § 15 that the Epistles referred to were the Epistles well known by reputation—the Epistles to the Corinthians. Jovinianus would hear with dismay, and the supporters of Jerome with joy, that these Clementine Letters had a great deal to say upon the question of virginity. This view of the question, no doubt, saves the reputation of Jerome as a polemical controversialist. He was not so foolish as first to use documents "polemically," and then to refer his opponents to a book of his own which would put it into their power to describe the transaction in less euphemistic language. But the gain to his controversial reputation is at the expense of his character as an honest man. If Jerome did this—and if Dr. Lightfoot's alternative is adopted he did do it—it was, as we have said, a piece of

thorough-going literary rascality, which would justify any amount of strong language. But we have no right to say or believe this concerning Jerome so long as the saying it, or believing it, is required for one purpose only, viz. to support the theory that he was acquainted with the Epistles to Virgins now in our hands. Dr. Lightfoot's "alternative, that in writing against Jovinianus, Jerome for polemical purposes assumed the genuineness of these Clementine Letters which he had silently ignored a year or two before," may be dismissed once for all, and ought never to have been suggested, because five minutes' study of Jerome's work against Jovinianus suffices to show its unreasonableness.

It must be further observed, however, that the situation is not very materially altered, if we suppose that Jerome in *adv. Jovin.* 12 refers in all honesty of purpose to the Epistles to Virgins. The fact remains that in § 26, where he has writings under the name of Clement distinctly in his mind, he refers his readers to the Catalogue, and to the neighbourhood of that section of it in which the writings of Clement are discussed, and in which only the so-called Epistles to the Corinthians are mentioned. He could not forget what he had written in § 12, nor yet his silence in the Catalogue. The thought must have crossed his mind, What will Jovinianus and my other readers think? A single sentence in § 26 would have sufficed to explain that these inestimable Letters had come into his hands quite lately, during his visit to Bethlehem. But he is silent.

Let us suppose Dr. Lightfoot to spend a summer holiday at Bethlehem, and to bring back with him two Epistles explaining in the clearest manner, and exactly in accordance with his own views, the method of church government instituted by Christ and His apostles, Epistles fully believed by him to be the genuine work of Clement of Rome. Would he, in a note to πρεσβυτέρων in Ignat. *Magn.* 6, say simply, "to these (the presbyters) S. Clement, the celebrated bishop of Rome, wrote letters in which he fully expounded all things concerning them"? Would he a page or two farther on, while still writing controversially upon church government, without a word of explanation refer his readers to the *Prolegomena* to his edition of Clement, from which they would learn that at

the time of writing those *Prolegomena* he had no knowledge whatever of any Epistles on church government from the pen of Clement? And the explanation which he did not give at that particular point would he withhold to the day of his death? Would he, while dealing again and again with the question of church government in published writings, never again refer to an authority which he believed to be absolutely conclusive in such a matter? Would he, when instructing young men as to what books on church government it would be well for them to read, pass these inestimable Letters by in silence? Would he keep so tight a hold upon these precious documents as to make it impossible for future generations to find in one of his contemporaries or in any later writer any mention of these Epistles? Only one answer is possible to these questions. No reason can be given why Jerome should act less like a reasonable being. We may be quite sure that if Dr. Lightfoot's solution—the visit to Bethlehem—is the true explanation of Jerome's silence as to the Epistles to Virgins in his Catalogue § 15, that he would have given that explanation in *adv. Jovin.* 26, and not have exposed himself either to the cavils of Jovinianus or the questionings of his own adherents.

Dr. Lightfoot may say, perhaps, that he never observed the reference to the Catalogue in *adv. Jovin.* 26. We can well believe it. This is the very thing of which we complain. He starts the difficulty which Jerome's silence as to our Epistles in his Catalogue raises, and propounds a solution which apparently he does not take the smallest trouble to verify. If he had read the work against Jovinianus, and other writings of Jerome, with a view to verification, he would have found not a few things besides the reference to the Catalogue which make his proposed solution of the difficulty quite impossible.

There is one explanation of Jerome's mention of Epistles of Clement in his work against Jovinianus, and again his silence in his Catalogue as to any other Epistles than those known as the Epistles to the Corinthians, and one only which will stand examination, and which will at the same time preserve Jerome's character for honesty and good sense. Neither Jerome nor Jovinianus, nor any other reader of Jerome's works, knew of any other Epistles under the name of Clement

than those to the Corinthians. Jerome knew nothing of the Epistles to Virgins. Of this plenty of proof will be advanced directly. He had no first-hand knowledge of the Epistles to the Corinthians. This is not the fitting opportunity for the full discussion of this point, but one or two remarks may perhaps be allowed, and which possibly may prove sufficient.

Dr. Lightfoot's only reason for supposing that Jerome had a personal knowledge of Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, is the presence in his description of it of the words "Quæ mihi videtur" (*vid. sup.* p. 19). What a sermon might be preached on this text! One wonders how often one has heard the words from the lips of men who never in their lives read one line in the original pages of the Fathers, who, as they say, "seem to them" to support their views; and not one line out of these pages which, if read, would tend to modify those views. "Quæ mihi videtur" is a phrase largely discounted in common life. It represents not uncommonly a second-hand opinion, and indicates that a man has read the morning paper, Liberal or Tory, as the case may be. "Quæ mihi videtur" has been said again and again by learned critics concerning these same Epistles to Virgins, and Dr. Lightfoot says it of his solution of Jerome's silence; but it does not even in the least bear witness to independent knowledge and research on the part of those who so say. And the phrase means as much or as little in the mouth of Jerome. When, as in the case before us, it is combined with "implicit copying" of the statements of Eusebius, it means that it seems so to Jerome, because it first of all seemed so to Eusebius. When there is no such copying, then it expresses either Jerome's independent opinion, or else that of some other person than Eusebius. Thus in § 25 Jerome gives an account of Theophilus and his writings. In the first part of his account he leans on Eusebius, in the latter part he speaks of writings of which Eusebius says nothing; and he has the phrase, "Qui mihi non videntur," but he prefaces the remark with "Legi sub nomine ejus," etc. In § 2 he has a "mihi videtur," but it is the expression only of a pious opinion as to a matter on which no amount of research could throw any light.

The value of Jerome's "mihi," or of the editorial "nos,"

may be tested out of § 45 concerning Polycrates. Jerome quotes a long passage, which he prefaces with "hæc pauca excerpsimus." At the close he adds "Hæc propterea posui, ut ingenium et auctoritatem viri ex parvo opusculo demonstrarem." If Jerome's language here is to be strictly pressed, it means that he knew the work, and copied the extract out of it. He nevertheless took it from Eusebius, as he did all his quotations. The comparison of this book of Jerome's with Eusebius brings to light some curious and even amusing things. Thus when Eusebius thought it proper to say that a certain work had survived to his own time, Jerome evidently thought that this was an excellent reason for supposing that it had survived a little longer, for he repeats the remark. But there is an interesting exception. In § 29 Jerome speaks of Tatian. Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 29) describes the Diatessaron, and says that it was in the hands of some even in his day. Jerome omits all mention of it. The reason would appear to be found in the fact (if a note in Heinichen may be trusted) that Rufinus referred the whole passage to Irenæus, quoted by Eusebius immediately above. It does not follow that Jerome used Rufinus' translation, for the little word that caused Rufinus to err may in like manner have misled Jerome, who would think that survival of a work in the days of Irenæus would not necessarily argue a survival in his own.

In § 38 Jerome gives an account of Clement of Alexandria, borrowed from Eusebius (*H. E.* vi. 13). He says "Meminit autem in Stromatibus suis, voluminis Tatiani adversus Gentes, de quo supra diximus, et Casiani cujusdam *χρονογραφίας*." So far he agrees with Eusebius, but he adds "Quod opusculum invenire non potui." This remark would convey to the unwary reader the idea that Jerome had exercised a vast amount of time and labour over the books of which he speaks. It, however, is nothing more than Jerome's polite way of correcting a slip which Eusebius had made. The works of Eusebius were, we very well know, in the hands of Jerome, and from *Præp. Evang.* x. 12 (if not from Clement himself) he would know that Clem. Alex. quoted the words of Cassianus *ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Ἐξηγητικῶν*. The book mentioned by Eusebius was the book mentioned by Clement. No one would be so absurd as to throw away his time in looking for a book which,

as he knew quite well, was at least not the book which Clement and Eusebius meant. It was a polite or perhaps sarcastic way of rectifying Eusebius' slip. A modern critic would have put the rectification into a learned footnote.

Now no one need wonder that these things are so. In his preface Jerome to a certain extent apologizes for deficiencies by pointing to the fact that he was writing in "hoc terrarum angulo (Bethleemi)." It is not to be supposed that he had at his back the resources of Eusebius. He plainly says that Eusebius was of the greatest service to him. It was indeed by his assistance alone that Jerome was carried bravely through the greater part of his task. To suppose that he had read all, or even any very large number of the works of which he speaks, would be absurd. If he had read them, it would have been far easier for him to have given the few words he cares to say concerning them out of his knowledge, than to have transcribed and remodeled the statements of Eusebius. Thus, for example, if he had had any real knowledge of Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians, he could have written a descriptive sentence in one minute. It must have been the work of very many minutes to have brought together the scattered statements of Eusebius, and adjusted them for his own purpose. As it is, while he implicitly copies Eusebius, he omits the pith and marrow of Eusebius' remarks by omitting all the historian's inferences, leaving the borrowed language, when transferred to his own page, empty of all point and force. If he had no real knowledge of the Epistle, Jerome of course could write, as he actually does write, only what Eusebius taught him. His want of knowledge is evident from the fact that in § 5, where he speaks of the various theories afloat concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews, even mentioning Clement's name, he nevertheless makes no allusion to the Epistle to the Corinthians, notwithstanding his declaration in § 15 as to the close resemblance of this Epistle to that to the Hebrews. It is quite unreasonable to lay stress upon "quæ mihi videtur."

Jerome therefore, it is fair to conclude, had no knowledge of the contents of the Epistle to the Corinthians except such as he might gain from quotations out of them, or descriptions of them by earlier writers. He might perhaps occasionally come across some one who had read them. Since then

Jerome mentions Epistles of Clement in *adv. Jovin.* 12, and refers to the Catalogue in § 26, and in that Catalogue is silent as to any other Epistles than the Epistles to the Corinthians, it is proper to infer that in *adv. Jovin.* 12 the Epistles mentioned by him are those to the Corinthians.

It will now be proved that whatever the Epistles were which are mentioned by Jerome in *adv. Jovin.* 12, at least they were not the Epistles to Virgins.

For what purpose does Jerome appeal to Epistles of Clement at all? Since he quotes nothing whatever, but magnifies the author, describing him as Clement the successor of S. Peter and the person spoken of by S. Paul as his fellow-worker, it is beyond contradiction that Jerome appealed to the Epistles not for the sake of their contents, but on account of the celebrated name of their author. Jovinianus had sought to prove that the apostles had neither by precept nor by practice encouraged celibacy. Jerome desired to meet him with a name of great authority in the Church. He named Clement, whose authority was second only to that of the apostles themselves. He had in his hand Epistles by this Clement, so runs the theory, which taught exactly that doctrine concerning virginity which was confessedly dearer to Jerome's heart than anything on earth. On this question he was wont to wax vehement, not to say fierce. How then comes it to pass that only once in the whole course of his life he appeals to this high authority? Scores and scores of passages might be produced where the language of Clement upon virginity, if Jerome knew it, would be very telling. Occasionally Jerome tells his readers what books it was worth their while to read. If there was any book in the wide world besides the Bible which Jerome thought to be good wholesome reading for all alike, it must have been Clement on Virginity. He is as dumb as if he had never heard of such a book. But if he himself had no knowledge of such a book, his silence is explained.

But though this is so, it is nevertheless certain that, if the Epistles to Virgins were in existence in Jerome's day, he knew them thoroughly and used them, but, with a self-repression which has no parallel in the annals of controversy, never appealed to Clement's authority save on this one occa-

sion only, early in his work against Jovinianus. In corroboration of this let this work be examined, and it will be seen that though sometimes he wants a good authority, and for the lack of it has to support his point with doubtful arguments, and so seems never to have read our Epistles, yet at other times quite manifestly he has his eyes on these Epistles if they were in existence, and borrows from them, yet without naming the authority which would have given tenfold weight to his own words.

In § 5 Jerome gives a compendious statement of some of Jovinianus' arguments. The first of these is connected with Gen. i. 28 "Increase and multiply," etc. Jerome's answer is in § 16, p. 266, but our Epistles are not cited, though in *Ep.* i. §§ 3, 4 Gen. i. 28 is discussed.

Farther on in the same section Jerome says:—

> Ac repente transcendit (Jovinianus) ad Eliam et Elisæum et narrat quasi grande mysterium, quod requieverit spiritus Eliæ in Elisæo; et cur hoc dixerit, tacet: nisi forte Eliam quoque et Elisæum habuisse arbitretur uxores.

In § 25, p. 275, Jerome replies: Eliam et Elisæum quam stulte in catalogo posuerit maritorum, me tacente, manifestum est. Si enim Joannes Baptista venit in spiritu et virtute Eliæ, et Joannes virgo est: utique non solum in spiritu ejus venit, sed etiam in corporis castitate.

Why does he not quote?—

> Joannes legatus . . . sanctus Domini nostri nuntius, virgo fuit . . . Sed et Eliam et Elisæum aliosque multos viros sanctos invenimus vitam egisse cælibem atque immaculatam.—*Ep.* i. 6.

Again, and still in the same section (5), Jerome writes:—

> Et ad Evangelium repente transcendens, Zachariam, et Elisabeth, Petrum ponit, et socrum ejus, cæterosque Apostolos.

In § 26, p. 278, Jerome replies, saying: Quamquam, excepto Apostolo Petro, non sit manifeste relatum de aliis Apostolis, quod uxores habuerint; et cum de uno scriptum sit, ac de cæteris tacitum, intelligere debemus sine uxoribus eos fuisse, de quibus nihil tale Scriptura significet. Et tamen ille qui nobis objecit Zachariam et Elisabeth, Petrum et socrum ejus, sciat, de Zacharia et Elisabeth Joannem fuisse generatum, id est, de nuptiis virginem, de Lege Evangelium, de matrimonio castitatem, ut a Propheta virgine, virgo Dominus et annuntiaretur, et baptizaretur. Possumus autem de Petro dicere, quod habuerit socrum eo tempore quo credidit, et uxorem jam non habuerit, quamquam legatur in περιόδοις et uxor

ejus, et filia. Sed nunc nobis de canone omne certamen est. Et quia ad Apostolos provocavit, quod principes disciplinæ nostræ, et Christiani dogmatis duces, ut eos interim virgines concedamus non fuisse (neque enim hoc præter Petrum probari potest) noverit hos esse Apostolos. . . . Et tamen Joannes unus ex discipulis, qui minimus traditur fuisse inter Apostolos, et quem fides Christi virginem repererat, virgo permansit, et ideo plus amatur a Domino, et recumbit super pectus Jesu. . . . si autem obnixe contenderit, Joannem virginem non fuisse, et nos amoris præcipui causam virginitatem diximus, exponat ille, si virgo non fuit, cur cæteris Apostolis plus amatus sit? . . . quod et nos in libro de Illustribus Viris breviter perstrinximus.

Here, while Jerome appeals only to the silence of Scripture as to the wives of the apostles, he actually refers to and therefore has in his mind writings under the name of Clement. How then could he forbear to quote *Ep.* i. 6 ?—

Deinde Joannes, *qui super pectus Domini nostri recubuit, quem valde diligebat*, is quoque virgo fuit; neque enim sine causa (obs. close of Jerome's remarks) Dominus noster illum diligebat. Paulus quoque et Barnabas et Timotheus cum reliquis aliis, *quorum nomina scripta sunt in libro vitæ*, hi, inquam, omnes castimoniam dilexerunt atque amarunt, etc., *vid. sup.* p. 13.

If Jerome knew the Epistles to Virgins now in our hands, and referred to them in § 12, he here, while apparently looking at the language of the Epistle, deliberately suppressed a piece of evidence which he must have believed to be absolutely conclusive. The suppression of facts which make for an opponent is common in controversy. It would be hard indeed to find a parallel suppression to this.

The suppression of the name of the Roman bishop is, however, even more remarkable in the passage just preceding that last quoted. The opinion which Jerome there expresses is a well-known one, constantly cited by editors of the New Testament. Jerome says:—

Si autem nobis illud opposuerit ad probandum, quod omnes Apostoli uxores habuerint, *Numquid non habemus potestatem mulieres vel uxores circumducendi* (quia γυνή apud Græcos utrumque significat) *sicut cæteri Apostoli, et Cephas, et fratres Domini*, jungat et illud quod in Græcis codicibus est: *Numquid non habemus potestatem sorores mulieres vel uxores circumducendi?* Ex quo apparet eum de aliis sanctis dixisse mulieribus, quæ juxta morem Judaicum magistris de sua substantia ministrabant, sicut legimus ipsi quoque Domino factitatum. Nam, et ordo verborum hoc significat: *Num-*

quid non habemus potestatem manducandi, et bibendi, aut sorores mulieres circumducendi? (1 Cor. ix. 4, 5). Ubi de comedendo et bibendo, ac de administratione sumptuum præmittitur, et de mulieribus sororibus infertur, perspicuum est, non uxores debere intelligi, sed eas, ut diximus, quæ de sua substantia ministrabant. Quod et in veteri Lege de Sunamitide illa scribitur, quæ solita sit Elisæum recipere, et ponere ei mensam et panem et candelabrum et cætera.

Compare *Ep.* ii. 15 :—

Multæ quidem sanctæ mulieres sanctis ministrarunt de bonis suis, veluti Sulamita illa ministravit Elisæo ; sed hæc cum eo non habitabat, verum habitabat propheta seorsum in domo ; (and after three or four lines speaking of the death of her son) Ex his igitur intellegere debemus (obs. Jerome's debere intelligi) illorum vivendi rationem. Jesu Christo Domino nostro mulieres de bonis suis ministrabant, sed non habitabant cum illo. Apostolis quoque et Paulo mulieres ministrasse invenimus, sed hi cum illis non habitabant, verum pudice et caste et immaculate coram Deo conversati sunt.

Now it is quite plain that this passage of Jerome cannot be independent of our Epistle. It is but one of a number of points of contact between the two writers which begin in Jerome at § 12 with the mention of the Epistles supposed to be our Epistles, and where there are coincidences of language enough in themselves alone to prove Jerome's actual knowledge of the Epistles to Virgins if such a thing was possible. Then how is his silence as to Clement's name to be explained? Why, when the personal history of the apostles is in question, does Jerome neither use the language nor quote the authority of one whose word on a question of that kind was not less weighty than that of Holy Scripture itself? He is at grips with his adversary, and has it in his power to give him an effectual fall, but deliberately lets the opportunity escape him. What can be the meaning of this? It is difficult to understand how any one can fail to see that the necessary inference is that Jerome knew nothing about the Epistles, and that it is their author who was the copyist.

So far our investigations have been confined to Jerome's work against Jovinianus. We must now pass to *Ep.* xxii. written to Eustochium specially upon the subject of virginity. This Letter was written before the Catalogue, and is referred to in it in § 135. If it be found that—if the Epistles were in existence—Jerome used them in this Letter, Dr. Lightfoot's theory that he had no knowledge of them

until after writing the Catalogue will be effectually disposed of. A single passage will amply suffice, not only because it is an exceedingly forcible one, but also because it has to be added to those which have been already pointed out, and which are not to be forgotten.

The passage in question is in *Ep.* xxii. §§ 11, 12 (p. 95), and is to be compared with *Ep.* ii. 7 sq., which will be placed alongside. It must be observed that in *adv. Jovin.* i. 7 (p. 247) the continency of Joseph is described and extolled, while in § 25 the History of Susannah is referred to and approved. This notice of Susannah comes just at the close of a list of examples taken from the Old Testament, and Jerome adds, "Huc usque de Lege," proceeding at once to the Gospel.

Investigemus atque inquiramus INDE A LEGE USQUE ad novum testamentum. Pulcrum quoque est atque utile, ut sciamus, quam multi viri et quinam perierint per mulieres, item quam multæ feminæ et quænam perierint per viros, ex adsiduitate, qua adsidui erant apud invicem. Porro etiam hoc indicabo, scilicet quam multi et quinam viri cum viris commorati sint toto vitæ suæ tempore et ad finem usque una permanserint in operationibus castis, immaculati. VIII. Atque hoc ita esse manifestum notumque est. Ad Joseph quod attinet . . . Hoc enim nequaquam prodest illis, qui *lumbos suos* volunt *succingere* veraciter. Sorores diligamus oportet in omni castitate et pudicitia et cum omni mentis continentia, in timore Dei, non assiduo cum illis commorantes nec quovis momento ad illas ingredientes. IX. Nonne audivisti de Samson Naziræo, *quocum erat spiritus Dei*, de viro illo robusto? . . . X. Nonne erudit te id, quod accidit David, quem Deus *invenerat virum secundum cor suum*, hominem fidelem, perfectum, sanctum, firmum. Pulchritudinem inspectavit hic mulieris cujuspiam, Bethsabæ dico, cum videret eam

In *Ep.* xxii. 11 sq. Jerome says:—

Job Deo carus, et testimonio ipsius immaculatus et simplex, audi quid de diabolo suspicetur: "Virtus ejus in lumbis et potestas ejus in umbilico" (Job xl. 11). . . . "Et ad Job dicit Deus: Accinge sicut vir lumbos tuos" (Job xxxviii. 5): Et Joannes zona pellicea cingitur et Apostoli jubentur accinctis lumbis, Evangelii tenere lucernas. . . . Omnis igitur adversus viros diaboli virtus in lumbis est: omnis in umbilico contra feminas fortitudo. 12. Vis scire ita esse, ut dicimus? Accipe exempla: Samson leone fortior et saxo durior, qui et unus et nudus mille persecutus est armatos, in Dalilæ mollescit amplexibus. David secundum cor Domini electus, et qui venturum Christum sanctum sæpe ore cantaverat, postquam deambulans super tectum domus suæ, Beth-

mundantem sese et lavantem nudam. Vidit hanc mulierem vir sanctus, et reapse captus est per voluptatem ex ejus conspectu. Animadvertite nunc . . . homicidium patravit David, qui *unctus Domini* vocatus est. Admonitus esto, o homo. . . . XI. Nonne legisti de Amnon et Thamar, liberis David? Amnon iste sororem suam appetebat . . . Quapropter non convenit nobis nec decet nos conversari cum sororibus. . . . XII. Nonne legisti de rebus gestis Salomon, filii David, cui Deus dederat sapientiam. . . . Atqui etiam ipse ille per mulieres periit et a Domino recessit. XIII. Nonne legisti et nosti de senioribus illis in diebus Susannæ, etc.

(*For complete text of these sections, vid. inf.* p. 39 *sq.*)

sabee captus est nuditate, adulterio junxit homicidium. Ubi, et illud breviter attende, quod nullus sit, etiam in domo, tutus aspectus. Quapropter ad Dominum pœnitens loquitur: "*Tibi soli peccavi* (σοὶ μόνῳ ἥμαρτον, LXX.), *et malum coram te feci*" (Psa. l. 4). Rex enim erat, alium non timebat. Salomon, per quem se cecinit ipsa Sapientia, qui disputavit a cedro Libani usque ad hyssopum, quæ exit per parietem, recessit a Domino, quia amator mulierum fuit. Et ne quis sibi de sanguinis propinquitate confideret, illicito Thamar sororis Amnon frater exarsit incendio. 13. Pudet (*al.* piget) dicere, quot quotidie Virgines ruant, quantas de suo gremio mater perdat Ecclesia. . . . Videas plerasque viduas, etc.—*Ep.* xxii. 11 sq.

No other examples are given either by Jerome or by our writer. In both cases the list is prefaced by the direction "to gird up the loins," and, if exposition is worth anything, in both cases "succingere veraciter." In both cases there is the remark, how many—of the female sex in Jerome, where Eustochium is addressed; of both sexes in our Epistle, which is addressed to both—have perished in the one case through men, and in the other through women and men. It should be observed how carefully this is done in our Epistle. We cannot, of course, forget the mention of Epistles of Clement in *adv. Jovin.* 12, and the very close connection between that work and our Epistles. It is impossible to forget it, for we find it again only a few lines farther on in *Ep.* ii. 14.[1]

[1] Our writer says "Ecce de Moyse et Aaron Scriptum invenimus, quod agerent et viverent cum viris, qui talem, qualem ipsi, vitæ rationem sequerentur. Atque ita quoque Josue, filius Nun. Mulier aliqua cum ipsis non erat, verum soli, viri cum viris," etc. In *adv. Jovin.* i. 22, to weaken the force of the argument that Moses had a wife, Jerome writes "Sicut ergo legimus quod Moyses, id est, Lex habuerit uxorem, ostende mihi, Jesum Nave vel uxorem habuisse, vel filios: et si potueris monstrare, victum me esse fateor." The writer of our Epistles goes on immediately to say that the Israelites journeyed, the men by themselves and the women by themselves; that after they had crossed the Red Sea (Mare

Even if the passage just quoted stood absolutely alone in the writings of Jerome, the connection between it and our Epistle could not have accidentally arisen. On the strength of a far less remarkable, though strictly parallel set of circumstances, Dr. Lightfoot considers both Cyprian and Basil to have made use of Clem. *ad Corinth.* i. 4 sq., and places (p. 10) them both in his list of witnesses to this Epistle. If indeed it were possible to find in any author earlier than Jerome the same list of examples, prefaced as this is here, it would then be a question how the relations subsisting among them should be adjusted. We have not succeeded in finding any such author, and it is necessary to conclude, as it was necessary before when *adv. Jovinianum* was in hand, that if the Epistles to Virgins were in existence in Jerome's day that he made use of them in *Ep.* xxii., that is to say, years before he wrote his Catalogue. Dr. Lightfoot's theory therefore, that Jerome gained his knowledge of our Epistles after writing the Catalogue, must be dismissed, not however without the expression of surprise that so simple a method of testing its value as consulting Jerome's earlier writings was not adopted.

This theory being now effectually disposed of, the difficulty which it was intended to meet comes back with full force. If Jerome knew the Epistles at all, he knew them all through his life. If *Ep.* lii. (*ad Nepotianum*) is carefully examined it will be found that he used them there also. Yet nowhere,

Suph), Moses sang praises (quoting Ex. xv. 1); then that Miriam sang (quoting Ex. xv. 20); then, after a very few lines, in § 15, that Christ sent out His twelve apostles two and two. Villecourt in his *Dissertatio Prævia*, replying to objections, points to the fact that occasionally the "filii Israel" are spoken of, and says: "Hic soli viri, quasi emphatice, designantur." It happens that Jerome in *Ep.* 77 comments one by one very briefly on the forty-two "Mansiones" of Israel in the desert. Each "Mansio" is prefaced by a text. In these texts sometimes "filii Israel" appear, and any one using *Ep.* 77 would have this fact before his eyes. In his remarks on "Mansio" 5 Ex. xv. 1 is quoted, and the action of Miriam is described. In "Mansio" 6, expounding the twelve fountains and the seventy palms, he writes "Duodecim fuisse Apostolos, et septuaginta discipulos minoris gradus, quos et binos ante se Dominus præmittebat," while "Mansio" 7 begins with "Mare Rubrum quod Hebraice dicitur Jam Suph." Here our writer might have all his ideas and quotations ready to his hand. It seems impossible to suppose that he did not use them. We cannot reverse the supposition and say that Jerome was the copyist. As our Epistles were evidently written in Greek (*vid. inf.* pp. 62, 88), one would not expect to find "Mare Suph."

even when describing Clement's writings, does he speak of these Epistles unless it be in *adv. Jovin.* 12. All that was said before concerning that work might be repeated concerning *Ep.* xxii. and *Ep.* lii. It has been proved already that it is incredible that Jerome should have used our Epistles "polemically." The only possible conclusion that common sense can accept is that Jerome knew nothing whatever about the Epistles to Virgins now in our hands, but that our writer, not Jerome, was the copyist.

This conclusion is borne out by the comparison of the two passages quoted above. The line which Jerome takes as to "girding up the loins" is strictly his own. We find it elsewhere (cf. *in Jerem.* i. 17, p. 842; *in Ephes.* vi. 14, p. 678). We see the application of the idea growing up in *Ep.* xxii. some way before the examples which follow it are given. Our writer's "succingere *veraciter*" suggests that he is the copyist. Our writer's examples are in strict chronological order. They are displaced in Jerome, and why they should be displaced by a copyist is not easy to see. Two examples are tacked on by our writer. They are found in *adv. Jovinianum.* But they are examples of chastity in the leading personages, not of the sin of uncleanness. To make them tell, the narratives have to be, as it were, turned round. These are not given together, but tacked on, the one at the beginning, the other at the end of Jerome's list, for chronological reasons. All these things suggest that the conclusion which on other grounds seems to be required is a sound one, viz. that whether the Epistles named by him in *adv. Jovin.* 12 were, or were not, Clement's Epistles to the Corinthians, at any rate they were not the Epistles to Virgins now in our hands. This conclusion carries us, however, a little farther. The Epistles to Virgins could not have been in existence in Jerome's day, because if they were Jerome used them—which is incredible.

3. The examination of the excerpt out of the First Epistle on Virginity by Clement, bishop of Rome, found by Cureton in a Syriac MS., must be deferred until further light has been cast upon our Epistles through the comparison of them with the *Homilies* of Antiochus. Nothing as yet, it will be observed, has been produced which forbids the notion that Timotheus

of Alexandria († A.D. 535) extracted the passage from an Epistle on Virginity written after Jerome's time.

The next witness to be examined therefore must be Antiochus Palæstinensis, an author unknown, in this capacity at least, to the numerous editors and critics of the Epistles to Virgins. In introducing a witness so important, it will be proper to give some account of him and his writings.

Antiochus was a monk of St. Saba, near Jerusalem, and is described as follows in Smith and Wace, *Dict. Christ. Biog.* p. 122 :—"He flourished in the reign of the Emperor Heraclius, and witnessed the capture and sack of Jerusalem by Chosroes A.D. 614, when the true Cross was carried away into Persia as the noblest trophy of conquest (*Hom.* cvii.; *Exomolog. sub fin.*). There is still extant, 'if what no one reads may be said to be extant (Gibbon, c. xlvi.),' a voluminous work of his entitled πανδέκτης τῆς ἁγίας γραφῆς, divided into 130 homilies, each enforcing some definite moral duty confirmed by passages of Scripture and the writings of the Fathers." As is too commonly the case with *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, the reader must turn to Smith's *Dict. Gr. Rom. Biog.* to learn that this work was first published in Latin by Tilman, Paris 1543, and in Greek by Fronto Ducæus in *Auctar. Bibl. Patr.*, Paris 1624.

Along with the many blessings which printing has brought to mankind there is at least one evil. Printing has to no small extent killed independent research. New editions of authors are only rearrangements of old ones in a better or worse form. A notice of an author such as that just quoted out of Smith and Wace can be written up out of Fabricius without any examination of the author's writings. A sneer from Gibbon can do duty for independent research. "If what no one reads may be said to be extant." We doubt the wisdom of the glee with which this sneer is quoted. The sneer surely cannot be literally true. The pages of editions of Ignatius and Hermas are adorned with quotations from and references to the *Homilies* of Antiochus with chapter and verse. It cannot surely be that the authorities upon these ancient writers have not examined the pages so conspicuously quoted. If we remember rightly it was a charge brought against the author of *Supernatural Religion*, that he filled his notes with references to pages that had never been read by

him. It cannot surely be that they who have made the accusation against him have been themselves guilty of his fault. At any rate, the authorities upon Ignatius and Hermas are the very persons who have pronounced judgment upon the Epistles to Virgins. Thus, for example, Funk among editors, and among critics the writer of the articles on *Clemens Romanus* and *Hermas* in *Dict. Christ. Biog.*, who in the second article makes mention of the *Homilies* of Antiochus. One or other of two things is certain. Either the pages of Antiochus have not been read, as Gibbon's sneer suggests, or else the critic of to-day, great as may be the advance which he has made in all matters relating to scholarship, has in no small degree lost—and this very much through the conveniences which printing affords—the power, which marked so conspicuously the labours of older critics, of carrying in the mind for further investigation and comparison whatever has been once read. The memories of the older critics were the books of reference which now adorn the shelves of the modern scholar. If Cotelier, to look no farther back, had had the editing of the Epistles to Virgins, a new edition would not now be so much needed as it is. Cotelier did *read* as well as *refer to* the pages of Antiochus.

The passage first selected consists of seven out of the sixteen sections of the Second Epistle (ii. 7–13 inclus.). These are given as they stand in Funk's[1] translation, with the omission, however, of the words enclosed by him in brackets, and which are his own additions for the better illustration, as he thinks, of the text. The passage of Antiochus is from *Hom.* 17 (*περὶ τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι γυναικῶν*). It is continuous, and nothing is omitted except a few texts strung together with *καὶ πάλιν*, *καὶ*, etc., introduced by Antiochus immediately after the short sentence placed opposite to § 7 of the Epistle. The texts are Ecclus. xxv. 24, 25, 21; Prov. iv. 25–27, v. 21, vi. 25, 26, vii. 21–23, 25–27. Antiochus' remarks that follow, and which are given below opposite to the sections of the Epistle, form his homily upon the texts. His remarks are closed by another string of illustrative texts. The earlier part of the homily, which is of

[1] All the passages from these Epistles quoted in this volume are taken from Funk's edition.

very much less length, is partly represented elsewhere in our Epistles. The refrain, so to call it, repeated again and again in the sections of the Epistle given below, is best described by the title of Antiochus' next homily, *Hom.* 18 *περὶ τοῦ μὴ ἐνδελεχίζειν ψαλλούσαις γυναιξίν.* We need not even quite omit *ψαλλούσαις*, for the text *μετὰ ψαλλούσης μὴ ἐνδελέχιζε* (Ecclus. ix. 4), on which the title of the homily leans, and which is found in it, is quoted by our writer in § 13 as illustrative of the history of Susannah, to which, however, it seems somewhat inappropriate. It is in its right place in *Hom.* 18. The only illustrative text given by our writer in § 10 is found also in this homily, and the only one in § 9 is in *Hom.* 17. Some of the other texts in § 13 are found in *Hom.* 19 *περὶ πορνείας.* Passages out of *Hom.* 18 will be given in the next chapter. It should be observed that our writer's § 13 is a homily of Antiochus in miniature.

We are stating these facts carefully, because it is very difficult to convey to our readers the impression which is made upon the mind of one who has the pages of the Epistles and those of the *Homilies* actually before his eyes as to the real nature of the relations subsisting between the two writers. Antiochus is well known as a copyist of Ignatius, Hermas, etc. When therefore it is said that considerable portions of our Epistles are found in his pages, the first thought—and one not to be set aside without good proof—is necessarily that here again he is the copyist. If it was so, then the broad fact appears, after very little inspection and comparison, that he dealt with our Epistles on entirely different principles from those which he applied to the writings of Dionysius the Areopagite, or of Ignatius, or of Hermas. Antiochus so seldom names the author from whom he borrows, that the reader of the *Homilies* has to rely entirely upon his perception of a change in Antiochus' style, and in the savour of his language for the detection of a quotation. But there is hardly an instance in which the reader does not instinctively feel the change from Antiochus to some other author almost the moment that he comes upon a quotation. There is nothing of this when Antiochus quotes, if he does quote, our Epistles. This is the main reason, in our belief, why the presence of the Epistles in the *Homilies* has remained so long

undiscovered. No one has ever suspected, even in those parts which most closely resemble our Epistles, that Antiochus was doing anything else than using his own words. The whole savour of our Epistles is lost in Antiochus. This savour must be pretty strong, for as Cardinal Villecourt reads, he seems to himself to hear the words of the blessed Clement; for as Dr. Lightfoot, Dr. Westcott, and many other "competent critics" read, they seem to themselves to hear a voice, not indeed of one quite so ancient as the celebrated Bishop of Rome, yet from the second, or at the latest the beginning of the third century. But this primitive tone, which has seemed to these critics so marked that the date of these Epistles might be thereby infallibly determined, is quite lost when Antiochus has transferred our Epistles to his own pages, if he did transfer them. In some cases this fact is more apparent than in others. But it is quite sufficiently evident in the example which is to follow. Any one can see that if Antiochus had cared to preserve the distinctive tone and spirit of the sections of our Epistles which stand in an altered form in his *Hom.* 17, he would have placed them in *Hom.* 18 *περὶ τοῦ μὴ ἐνδελεχίζειν ψαλλούσαις γυναιξίν*, for he does not confine his attention to singing women.

VII. Consideremus nunc, fratres, et videamus, quomodo gesserint sese omnes patres justi toto tempore incolatus vitæ suæ; investigemus atque inquiramus inde a lege usque ad novum testamentum. Pulcrum quoque est atque utile, ut sciamus, quam multi viri et quinam perierint per mulieres, item quam multæ feminæ et quænam perierint per viros, ex adsiduitate, qua adsidui erant apud invicem. Porro etiam hoc indicabo, scilicet quam multi et quinam viri cum viris commorati sint toto vitæ suæ tempore et ad finem usque una permanserint in operationibus castis, immaculati.

Ἀκούσωμεν οὖν τί περὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ θεία Γραφὴ διαγορεύει. . . .

VIII. Atque hoc ita esse manifestum notumque est. Ad Joseph quod attinet fidelem, prudentem, sapientem, justum, usquequaque timoratum, nonne casti sanctique illius pulcritudinem mulier libidinose concupivit? Cumque ille libidinosam ejus voluntatem perficere recusaret, hæc falso testimonio virum justum illum in summam afflictionem et miseriam

πῶς δὲ καὶ ἡ Αἰγυπτία; ἣ τὴν μορφὴν τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ ἐπεπόθησε σαρκὸς πόθῳ, τοῦ ὄντος σεμνοτά του· καὶ τούτου μὴ ἐπινεύσαντος, εἰς θλίψεις καὶ στενοχωρίας διὰ τῆς ψευδηγορίας τὸν εὐσεβῆ περιέπειρεν ἕως θανάτου. Ὁρᾷς, ὅτι ὁ ἐντελεχισμὸς σαρκὸς τῆς Αἰγυπτίας πόσην κατειργάσατο τοῦ δικαίου θλίψιν; Διὰ τοῦτο οὖν πᾶσι τρόποις συμφέρον ἡμῖν ἐστιν ἀπέχεσθαι

projecit, immo et in vitæ[1] discrimen. Deus autem eripuit eum ex omnibus malis, quæ per infelicem illam mulierem illi supervenerant. Videtis, fratres, quantas ærumnas justo huic viro attulerit continuus aspectus corporis Ægyptiacæ. Itaque ne assidui simus cum mulieribus aut cum adulescentulis. Hoc enim nequaquam prodest illis, qui *lumbos suos* volunt *succingere* veraciter. Sorores diligamus oportet in omni castitate et pudicitia et cum omni mentis continentia, in timore Dei, non assiduo cum illis commorantes nec quovis momento ad illas ingredientes.

ἀπ' αὐτῶν. Οὐ γὰρ ἔχουσι λυσιτέλειαν αἱ αὐτῶν συντυχίαι τοῖς θέλουσιν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τὴν ὀσφὺν περιζώσασθαι.

IX. Nonne audivisti de Samson Naziræo, *quocum erat spiritus Dei*, de viro illo robusto? Atqui virum illum, qui Naziræus erat et Deo sacratus, fortis atque robustus, hunc mulier perdidit infelici suo corpore et prava libidine. Tune forte talis es, qualis erat ille? Nosce te ipsum et nosce modum tuum. *Mulier*[2] *maritata animas pretiosas prædatur.* Quapropter nemini prorsus permittimus, ut commoretur apud maritatam, multi minus, ut quis cum sacrata Deo virgine cohabitet aut dormiat, ubi assiduus sit cum illa. Hoc enim aversandum et detestandum est ab iis, qui Deum timent.

Οὐκ ἤκουσας περὶ τοῦ Σαμψὼν Ναζωραίου, μεθ' οὗ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ κυρίου ἐπορεύετο; καὶ τὸν τοιοῦτον ἅγιον ἡ γυνὴ ἀπώλεσε διὰ τῆς μοχθηρᾶς σαρκός, καὶ ἀθεμίτου ἐπιθυμίας. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐδ' ὅλως ἐπιτρεπόμεθα, μετὰ γυναικὸς καθίσαι, ἢ ἔχειν συντυχίας, τὸ σύνολον.

X. Nonne erudit te id, quod accidit David, quem Deus *invenerat virum secundum cor suum*, hominem fidelem, perfectum, sanctum, firmum. Pulcritudinem inspectavit hic mulieris cujuspiam, Bethsabæ dico, cum videret eam mundantem sese et lavantem nudam. Vidit hanc mulierem vir sanctus, et reapse captus est per voluptatem ex ejus conspectu. Animadvertite nunc, quanta mala fecerit illius mulieris causa: et peccavit justus ille vir et mandatum dedit, ut maritus illius interficeretur in prælio. Vidistis, quot dolos malos struxerit et adhibuerit; et cupidine istius mulieris homicidium patravit

Ὁμοίως καὶ περὶ τοῦ Δαυὶδ οὐ πεπαίδευσαι, ὃν καὶ εὗρεν ὁ Θεὸς ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ; Πῶς μορφῇ γυναικός, λέγω δὲ τῆς Βερσαβεέ, ἐπιθυμήσας, πόσοις κακοῖς περιέπεσε; ταύτην γὰρ ἰδὼν ὁ ἅγιος ἀληθῶς λουομένην, ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ τῆς μορφῆς αὐτῆς γενόμενος, πόσην κακίαν ὁ παμμέγιστος ἀνὴρ κατειργάσατο; καὶ ἥμαρτεν εἰς Θεὸν οὐ μόνον τῇ μοιχίᾳ περιπεσών, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς ἀναιρεθῆναι κελεύσας· ὁρᾷς πόσην δραματουργίαν κακίας ἐτελεσιούργησε διὰ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ὁ χριστὸς κυρίου Δαυίδ; παιδευθῶμεν τοῦ μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν. Εἰ γὰρ τηλικοῦτοι ἄνδρες διὰ γυναικῶν ἐάλωσαν, πῶς ἡμεῖς οἱ ἀνίσχυες μετὰ τῆς ἑαυτῶν

[1] "Verbotenus: *usque ad mortem.*"—Funk. Cf. Antiochus.

[2] Prov. vi. 26, which (preceded by v. 21) Antiochus joins with Prov. vii. 21, and in this homily, just before his remarks upon Joseph, quotes thus: *ὅτι γυνὴ ἀνδρῶν τιμίων* (*τιμίας*, LXX.) *ψυχὰς ἀγρεύει. Πλανᾷ γὰρ τὸν ἄνθρωπον πολλὴ ὁμιλία.* Cf. our writer's context. Anton. Mel. (I. *Serm.* 15, p. 27) quotes the text with *τιμίων*, and precedes it with Prov. v. 21 as Antiochus does.

David, qui *unctus Domini* vocatus est. Admonitus esto, o homo. Nam si tales tantique viri per mulieres perierunt, quænam tandem tua virtus est aut quisnam tu inter sanctos, ut cum mulieribus aut cum adulescentulis converseris diu noctuque, cum multa joculatione, absque timore Dei. Non ita, fratres, non ita agamus secundum lapsum illorum, verum memores simus effati illius de muliere, quo dictum est: *Manus*[1] *ejus laqueos tendunt et cor ejus retia pandit; justus evadet ab illa, improbus autem in manus ejus cadet.* Itaque nos sancti devitemus cohabitare cum feminis Deo sacratis. Neque enim decora est hujusmodi agendi ratio nec convenit servis Dei.

πτώσεως διαπορευόμενοι, καὶ ἐν μέσῳ παγίδος διαβαίνοντες ἐκφευξώμεθα;

XI. Nonne legisti de Amnon et Thamar, liberis David? Amnon iste sororem suam appetebat eamque oppressit nec eidem pepercit, propterea quod turpi libidine eam concupivisset. Et improbus scelestusque evasit ob assiduam ejus cum illa conversationem, quæ non erat in timore Dei; et *fœdam rem operatus est in Israel.* Quapropter non convenit nobis nec decet nos conversari cum sororibus inter risus et petulantiam, sed cum omni verecundia ac castitate et in timore Dei.

Ὁμοίως καὶ Ἀμμὼν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ Θάμαρ ἀνῃρέθη καλῶς. (? κακῶς.)

XII. Nonne legisti de rebus gestis Salomon, filii David, cui Deus dederat sapientiam et scientiam et amplitudinem animi et divitias et gloriam majora quam omnibus hominibus. Atqui etiam ipse ille per mulieres periit et a Domino recessit.

Ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ Σολομὼν ἔχων σοφίαν καὶ φρόνησιν, καὶ χύμα καρδίας, καὶ πλοῦτον, καὶ δόξαν πολλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντας, καὶ οὗτος διὰ γυναικὸς ἀπώλετο, καὶ ἀποστάτης ἐγένετο διὰ γυναῖκας.

XIII. Nonne legisti et nostri de senioribus illis in diebus Susannæ, qui propterea, quod assidui erant cum mulieribus et alienam inspectabant pulcritudinem, in barathrum ceciderunt concupiscentiæ; nec potuerunt in casta mente retinere sese, verum superati sunt a pravo suo animo, et adorti sunt beatam Susannam, ut eam

Καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι οἱ κατὰ Σουσάνναν κριταὶ διὰ τὸ ἐνδελεχίζειν καὶ καταμανθάνειν κάλλος ἀλλότριον, εἰς τὸ πέλαγος τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἐμπέσοντες, ἐπανέστησαν τῇ μακαρίᾳ Σουσάννῃ.—*Hom.* 17.

[1] Eccles. vii. 27, quoted in *Hom.* 18. Antiochus uses the LXX., which he alters—πικρότερον ὑπὲρ θάνατον συζητεῖν γυναῖκα, ἥτις θήρευμα, καὶ σαγήνη καρδία αὐτῆς· δεσμὸς εἰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς· ἀγαθὸς πρὸ προσώπου τοῦ Θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. Antiochus immediately follows it with Eccles. xi. 9 . . . καὶ γνῶθι ὅτι ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις ἄξει σε ὁ Θεὸς ἐν κρίσει. Anton. Mel. (I. *Serm.* 59, p. 103) quotes this text thus: καὶ γνῶθι σαυτόν· ὅτι ἐν πᾶσι κ.τ.λ. Cf. our writer's "tune forte talis es, qualis erat ille? Nosce te ipsum et nosce modum tuum," in § 10 immediately before Prov. vi. 26. See previous note. Anton. Mel. borrows from Max. *Serm.* 56. Both these writers have εἰ βούλει γνῶναι Θεόν, προλαβὼν γνῶθι σαυτόν ascribed to Clement (obs.) followed immediately by εἰ θνητὸς εἶ, βέλτιστε, θνητὰ καὶ φρόνει. Cf. our writer's "tune forte talis es, qualis erat ille?" that is, mortal. Observe, too, that in § 10 our writer has the same thought in mind: "quænam tandem tua virtus," etc.

vitiarent. Illa autem minime obtemperavit turpi istorum libidini, sed Deum invocavit, et eripuit eam Deus de manibus iniquorum senum istorum. Nonne igitur commoveri nos oportet et timere ob hoc, quod senes illi, judices et seniores populi Dei, honore suo exciderint propter mulierem? Scilicet recordati non sunt illius, quo dictum est: *Alienam*[1] *pulcritudinem ne inspectes;* aut illius: *Pulcritudo mulieris multos perdidit;* aut hujus: *Cum muliere maritata ne sedeas;* aut rursus illius, quod dixit: *Num est aliquis, qui ignem ponat in sinum suum et vestimenta sua non comburat?* aut hujus: *Num incedat aliquis super ignem, quin pedes ejus adurantur? Sic nemo, qui ad maritatam ingreditur, culpa vacabit nemoque evadet, qui ad illam appropinquat.* Et rursus dixit: *Pulcritudinem mulieris noli concupiscere, ut ne captivet te palpebris suis;* et alibi: *Adulescentulam ne inspectes, ut ne pereas illius desiderio;* et: *Cum muliere, quæ pulcre canit, noli esse assiduus;* et: *Qui stare sese existimat, videat, ne cadat.*

The sections of the Epistle quoted above will be of course at once recognised as those to which Jerome's *Ep.* xxii. has been shown to be so closely related. It would be perhaps natural, but altogether a mistake, from this fact to jump to the conclusion that Antiochus must be the copyist so far as the Epistles are concerned. If the language of Antiochus placed opposite to *Ep.* ii. 10 is examined, the words καὶ ἥμαρτεν εἰς Θεὸν οὐ μόνον will be seen. They appear a quite obvious use of Ps. l. 4 (LXX.), which stands exactly in the parallel place in Jerome (*vid. sup.* p. 33). The language of the Epistle is a little different,—et peccavit justus ille vir et mandatum dedit,—and the verbal coincidence disappears. Nothing conclusive can, however, be determined.

The inquiry will, however, be advanced a step if it is pointed out that Antiochus did unquestionably borrow from Jerome (*Ep.* xxii.) some things which are in no way represented in our Epistles. In § 6, p. 92, Jerome says:—

Nolo sinas cogitationes crescere. Nihil in te Babylonium, nihil confusionis adolescat. Dum parvus est hostis, interfice: nequitia, ne zizania crescant, elidatur in semine. Audi Psalmistam dicentem: "*Filia Babylonis misera, beatus qui retribuet tibi retributionem tuam quam retribuisti nobis. Beatus qui tenebit, et allidet parvulos tuos*

[1] The texts quoted are Ecclus. ix. 8, 9, 12; Prov. vi. 27, 28, 29, 25; Eccles. ix. 5, 4; 1 Cor. x. 12. They occur, except Ecclus. ix. 12 and 1 Cor. x. 12, in *Homilies* 19, 17, 18.

ad petram" (μακάριος ὃς κρατήσει καὶ ἐδαφιεῖ τὰ νήπιά σου πρὸς τὴν πέτραν, Ps. cxxxvi. 8, 9, LXX.). Quia enim impossibile est in sensum hominis non irruere innatum medullarum calorem, ille laudatur, ille prædicatur beatus, qui ut cœperit cogitare sordida, statim interficit cogitatus, et allidit ad petram: "*petra autem Christus est*" (1 Cor. x. 4).

Compare χρὴ οὖν τὴν πρώτην προσβολὴν ἀεὶ ἀνατρέπειν, καὶ ἐξολοθρεύειν τοὺς ἁμαρτωλοὺς λογισμοὺς ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν κατὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ Κυρίου (obs. *zizania*). καὶ ὡς ἔτι εἰσὶ νήπιοι υἱοὶ Βαβυλῶνος, τουτέστιν οἱ πονηροὶ λογισμοί, ἐδαφίζειν τούτους καὶ συντρίβειν πρὸς τὴν πέτραν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός.—*Hom.* 81.

When these passages are compared, it must be evident that Antiochus, out of the very pages which are closely copied both in the *Homilies* and the Epistles, borrows language and ideas of Jerome independently of our writer (if he was a different person), for the passage now quoted from *Hom.* 81 has nothing answering to it in the Epistles. If it should be urged that Antiochus might have borrowed from Eusebius (*Comment. in Ps.* 136), as Jerome no doubt did, or from Origen (*Select. in Ps.* 136), the reply will be that Eusebius speaks of "seeds of evil" not of thoughts, and that Origen, though he speaks of "thoughts," does not quote 1 Cor. x. 4. Jerome's language alone covers that of Antiochus. The close connection between these same pages of Jerome and *Hom.* 17, whatever be the true meaning of it, must not be forgotten.

It is thus plain that both Antiochus and our writer, if they were really different persons, use the same pages of Jerome. They meet in the use of the selfsame passage, but they also use Jerome independently of one another.

We have before us, therefore, three versions of the same passage—Jerome's (*vid. sup.* p. 32 sq.) the shortest, Antiochus', and our writer's, which is by far the most diffuse. The impression which the careful comparison of them seems to leave upon the mind is that Jerome's was the earliest written, and our writer's the last. If Antiochus' was the last written, one cannot fail to ask, without receiving any sufficient answer, why he trimmed down the language of our writer, taking out of it almost the whole of its distinctive character, while, nevertheless, if that language had been left unaltered, the entire sections would have admirably suited Antiochus' (*Hom.*

18) *περὶ τοῦ μὴ ἐνδελεχίζειν ψαλλούσαις γυναιξίν* (*vid. sup.* p. 39).

A few passages will now be given out of *Ep.* i. and compared with Antiochus.

Ep. i. 2, with the beginning of § 3, is found almost completely in four different homilies (130, 1, 98, 111). *There is no repetition.* On the supposition that Antiochus was the copyist, this could hardly have happened with a work so extensive and so varied in subject as these 130 homilies, unless he deliberately marked through with his pen the passages already used. If, on the other hand, our writer made excerpts and then worked them up into one writing, his work would necessarily stand in that relation to the *Homilies* which appears upon examination.

The passage from *Ep.* i. 2, found in *Hom.* 130, presents no special feature of interest, and we pass it by. It is followed in that homily immediately by the greater part of *Ep.* i. 8, concerning which something will be said in the next chapter (*vid. inf.* p. 76).

The next passage, following the first without pause, stands as under:—

πρῶτον δεῖ πιστεύειν εἰς "Θεόν, ὅτι ἔστιν, καὶ τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν αὐτὸν μισθαποδότης γίνεται." πίστις γὰρ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα στήσεται· καὶ "'Ο δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται." Ὁ δὲ ὄντως δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως πίστιν ἔχει ἐνεργῆ, πίστιν αὐξάνουσαν, πίστιν πεπληροφορημένην, πίστιν φωτίζουσαν ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς ἔργοις, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ τῶν ὅλων Θεός. πίστις ἀρχὴ κολλήσεως Θεοῦ. Ὁ τέλειος πιστὸς "λίθος ναοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχει ἡτοιμασμένος εἰς οἰκοδομὴν Θεοῦ Πατρός, ἀναφερόμενος εἰς τὰ ὕψη, διὰ τῆς μηχανῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· ὅ ἐστι σταυρὸς σχοίνῳ χρώμενος τῷ Πνεύματι" κ.τ.λ. (Ignat. *Ephes.* 9.) *Hom.* i. (*περὶ πίστεως*).

Scilicet qui revera pius est, ejus opera de fide ipsius testantur, quod verus sit fidelis, fide magna, fide perfecta, fide in Deo, fide quæ *luceat in bonis operibus*, ut omnium *pater* per Christum *glorificetur*.—*Ep.* i. 2.

The passage from the Epistle is the same as that which stands in the middle of Antiochus' words, and it is self-evident that it is borrowed from it. For while the object in taking the words of Ignatius is manifest, inasmuch as he gets some ideas perhaps nowhere else to be found together, Antiochus gets nothing from the Epistle which is not equally found in the familiar text "Let your light so shine before

men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." The passage from Ignatius is accurately taken, except that Antiochus has altered the λίθοι of Ignatius into the singular, as he was obliged to do, and the *ναοῦ πατρός* of Ignatius into *ναοῦ Θεοῦ*, an alteration which suits his subject. On the principle according to which this alteration is made, it may be said that the "omnium pater" of our writer is altered into the *ὁ τῶν ὅλων Θεός* of Antiochus. If there were nothing else to be observed one might well believe it. But there is a good deal more. The important clause in our writer's language is certainly "fide in Deo." In the passage as it stands in Antiochus the clause has disappeared (*vid. sup.* p. 39). Why should he omit it? It is easy to see how the clause might have been taken in by our writer, for above is *πιστεύειν εἰς Θεόν*. Then again our writer has "omnium pater per Christum." Antiochus does not have "per Christum." Why should he omit this? The words *Πατρὸς . . . διὰ τῆς μηχανῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* are there, but they are the words of Ignatius. Then again the *ὄντως δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως* is plainly not taken from our Epistle, but from Heb. x. 38, which immediately precedes, and which does not occur in the Epistle. From Heb. x. 22 (*ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως*) again comes Antiochus' *πίστιν πεπληροφορημένην*. When these various expressions are traced home nothing is left but the use of a familiar text (S. Matt. v. 16), for which, certainly, Antiochus did not want our writer's help. Nothing can well be plainer than that our writers took the passage of Antiochus and filled in "fide in Deo" and "per Christum," and made some alterations, partly, perhaps, with a view to easier translation into Syriac.

The third passage consists of two texts, Prov. iii. 3, 4 and Prov. iv. 18, and immediately follows the last. Our writer says:—

Ii ergo, qui in veritate virgines sunt propter Deum, obœdiunt illi, qui dixit: *Justitia et fides ne tibi deficiant; alliga illas collo tuo, et invenies animæ tuæ misericordiam; et meditare bona coram Deo et coram hominibus. Semitæ justorum ergo veluti lux lucent, crescitque illarum lux, donec firma stet dies.—Ep.* i. 2.

Cf. *ὁ γὰρ οὕτω φιλόπτωχος ἀκούει τοῦ λέγοντος· "Ἐλεημοσύναι καὶ πίστις μὴ ἐκλειπέτωσάν σε· ἄφαψαι δὲ αὐτὰς ἐπὶ σῷ τραχήλῳ, καὶ εὑρήσεις χάριν* (*et* ins. Tilm.), *προνοοῦ καλὰ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώ-*

πων." Καί· "Ὁδοὶ δικαίων, ὁμοίως φωτὶ λάμπουσιν. προπορεύονται καὶ φωτίζουσιν ἕως κατορθώσῃ ἡ ἡμέρα."—*Hom.* 98.

These texts are almost exactly taken from the LXX. It would be impossible probably to find any third example of the combination of these three verses. The point of our writer's prefatory remark lies in the word "obey." Here again, as so often (*vid. sup.* p. 39), a weaker word, *ἀκούει*, is used by Antiochus. Our writer's alteration of the language of the second text suggests that he was the copyist. The alteration is made to suit his following remarks, for he adds "Etenim radii lucis illorum etiam nunc illustrant," etc.

"Virgines propter regnum cælorum," again, would be the regular expression, not "propter Deum." If our writer, following the lead of Antiochus, had inserted the texts quoted above in their proper place, they would have followed "ut fratres atque peregrinos diligamus propter Deum et propter eos, qui credunt in Deum, sicut ex lege ac prophetis et a Domino nostro," etc. (*Ep.* i. 12; *vid. inf.* p. 70). Our writer's "propter Deum" is thus accounted for, while the "qui credunt in Deum," an alien thought in § 12, is found in the passage last considered, which has "fide in Deo" (*vid. sup.* p. 44).

The fourth of the passages mentioned above (p. 44) is found in *Hom.* 111 (*περὶ ἡγουμένων*). It includes the last sentence of *Ep.* i. 2 and the first part of § 3, and runs into a passage which occurs in *Hom.* 21 (*περὶ παρθενίας*). The passages tell their own tale as to which was first written, and may be left to speak for themselves when placed side by side.

Nam hominem Dei oportet in omnibus verbis factisque suis perfectum esse adornatumque in sua ratione agendi omnimoda honestate atque ordine et recte facere opera sua omnia. III. Sunt enim utriusque sexus virgines pulcrum quoddam exemplar, fidelibus et iis, qui futuri sunt fideles. Nomen autem solum sine operibus non introducet in regnum cælorum; si quis autem fuerit fidelis in veritate, is salvari poterit. Nam quod quis nomine tantum vocatur fidelis, operibus autem non est, non ideo illi contingit, ut sit revera fidelis. Igitur *ne quisquam decipiat vos vanis sermonibus erroris.*

Χρὴ οὖν τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καὶ λόγῳ ἐξηρτύσθαι καὶ κομεῖσθαι, καὶ εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν πάντα πράττειν, πρὸς ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν αὐτῷ πειθομένων. Ὁ γὰρ ἡγούμενος, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ προηγεῖσθαι, καλεῖται ἡγούμενος. Ὄνομα γὰρ ψιλὸν οὐκ εἰσάγει εἰς βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, οὐδὲ ὁ λόγος ἄπρακτος ὠφελεῖ τὸν ἀκούοντα· ἀλλὰ πρᾶξις ἐνδύναμος ἀληθινὸν ποιμένα ἀποδείκνυσιν.—*Hom.* 111.

Nam eo, quod nomen virginis cuipiam fuerit, si desunt illi opera præcellentia et pulcra et virginali statui convenientia, salvari non poterit. Etenim Dominus noster istiusmodo virginitatem *stultam* vocavit, prout dixit in evangelio; quæ quidem propterea, quod nec oleum habebat neque lumen, relicta fuit extra regnum cælorum et prohibita a gaudio sponsi et cum sponsi adversariis computata. Nimirum apud eos, qui tales sunt, solummodo est *species pietatis; virtutem autem ejus abnegant.* Apud se *existimant se esse aliquid, cum nihil sint, et errant. Unusquisque* ergo *exploret opera sua* seque ipse noscat; nam *vanum cultum* exhibet, quicumque virginitatem et sanctimoniam profitetur, *virtutem autem ejus abnegat.*

Ὁ νεανίσκος τοίνυν, τουτέστιν ὁ ἑαυτὸν εὐνουχίσας διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν, καὶ ἡ παρθένος, ἐὰν μὴ κατὰ πάντα τοιοῦτοι ὦσιν, ὥσπερ οἱ ἀληθινοὶ μιμηταὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὐ δύνανται σωθῆναι. Τὸ γὰρ λέγεσθαι παρθένον, καὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς μὴ ἔχειν ἀναλόγους, καὶ οἰκείους καὶ ἁρμοζούσας τῇ παρθένῳ, μωρὰν τὴν τοιαύτην παρθένον φησὶν ὁ κύριος. Ἀφεγγὴς γὰρ οὖσα καὶ ἀνέλαιος, ἔξω τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐγκλείεται, νυμφίου χαρᾶς στερηθεῖσα, καὶ μετὰ τῶν μισούντων τὸν νυμφίον λογισθήσεται. Δοκεῖ γὰρ εἶναί τι ἡ ἄπρακτος μηδὲν οὖσα, καὶ φρεναπατᾷ ἑαυτήν. Δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἕκαστος τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἐπιγινωσκέτω, ὅτι θρησκεία ἐστὶν μάταιος, παρθενίαν καὶ ἐγκράτειαν ὁμολογοῦντες ἔχειν, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἠρνημένοι.—*Hom.* 21.

These passages tell their own tale. It is plain that our writer has expanded the idea of the "mere name," and imported into the first passage the thought "salvari poterit," which Antiochus could not have omitted had he been the copyist, and which both he and our writer have afterwards. The text again (Ephes. v. 6) is an obvious interpolation. The passages, however, speak for themselves, and need no comment.

At the end of § 3 and in § 4 our writer has a good deal to say in connection with Gen. i. 28 (*increase and multiply*, etc.). The corresponding passage in Antiochus is found at the beginning of *Hom.* 127 (*περὶ φόβου τοῦ Θεοῦ*). The comparison of the two writers shows a good many points of interest, *e.g.* ὁ τοιοῦτος *τὴν ἁγνείαν ἐγκομβοῦται*[1] (Ant.); "omni sancta Dei virtute accingi debet" (Epistle). The discussion would however run on to great length, for the whole would require careful comparison with Jerome. We could not, moreover, deal with it with perfect satisfaction from the interesting fact that our writer used a copy of Antiochus corresponding to that used by Tilman in putting forth his Latin version. In this version there is a sentence including the text (Gen. i. 28), which is

[1] From 1 Pet. v. 5. In *Hom.* 109 the text runs *πάντες δὲ ἐν ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκομβώσασθε.*

not in Fronto Ducæus' Greek version. The sentence will be found in brackets in Migne's *Patrol. Græc.* tom. lxxxix. col. 1830. This fact has of course an importance of its own, and consequently it is here recorded. Our present inquiry is, however, in no way concerned to know the particular copy of the *Homilies* to which the Epistles to Virgins are related.

It may be difficult to find out what it was which took our writer away from *Hom.* 21 and induced him to launch forth into the remarks upon Gen. i. 28 found at the close of *Ep.* i. 3 and in § 4, but there is no difficulty at all in finding the place in the Epistles where the broken thread of ideas was resumed.

It is pointed out above (p. 47) that our writer imports a "salvari poterit" into a passage from *Hom.* 111 out of *Hom.* 21. The next example to be found in our Epistles of the use of this expression is in *Ep.* i. 7. Exactly at that point the copying from *Hom.* 21 is resumed, and the language immediately following that quoted above (p. 47) is taken. The passages, placed side by side, stand thus :—

Itaque nemo, qui virginitatem profitetur, sive frater sive soror, salvari poterit, nisi sit omnino sicut Christus, et sicut illi *qui sunt Christi.* Scilicet quicumque cælibem vitam agit secundum Deum, sive frater sive soror, castus ille est corpore et spiritu atque in cultura Domini sui assiduus; neque discedit ab eo aliorsum, sed quovis tempore famulatur in puritate et sanctitate in spiritu Dei, *sollicitus, quomodo placeat Domino suo,* estque sollicitus, ut quavis in re illi placeat. Talis a Domino nostro non recedit, verum spiritu cum Domino suo est, sicut scriptum est: *Estote sancti, sicut ego sanctus sum, dicit Dominus.* VIII. Neque enim si quis nomine tantum sanctimonialis vocatur, jam sanctimonialis est: verum omnino sanctimonialis esse debet et corpore et spiritu, etc.

Ἡ γὰρ ὄντως εὐνουχία, καὶ ἡ ὄντως παρθενία ἐν κυρίῳ, ἁγία ἐστὶν τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ἀπερισπάστως καὶ εὐπαρέδρως τῷ κυρίῳ λατρεύουσα ἐν Πνεύματι Θεοῦ, καθαρῶς καὶ ἀμιάντως ἀρέσκουσα τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ἀεὶ μεριμνῶσα πῶς ἀρέσει αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐν Πνεῦμά ἐστιν πρὸς κύριον, καθὼς γέγραπται· "Ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιός εἰμι," λέγει κύριος. Οὐ γὰρ ὀνόματι μόνον ψιλῷ ὁ ἅγιος, ἅγιός ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ ὁ ἅγιος, τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι.—*Hom.* 21.

Now our writer, taking up *Hom.* 21 and purposing to take into his work the passage quoted, would see before him the passage last quoted (p. 47) out of this homily. He would see, therefore, this :—ὁ νεανίσκος τοίνυν, τουτέστιν ὁ ἑαυτὸν εὐνουχίσας διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν, καὶ ἡ παρθένος, ἐὰν μὴ κατὰ

πάντα τοιοῦτοι ὦσιν, ὥσπερ οἱ ἀληθινοὶ μιμηταὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὐ δύνανται σωθῆναι. Compare our writer's opening words in the passage just quoted. The same words were copied before by our writer in § 3 (*vid. sup.* p. 47). He would see also ὅτι θρησκεία ἐστὶν μάταιος (copied above, p. 47). Compare our writer's "in cultura Domini," which has nothing answering to it in the language of Antiochus placed alongside (see above). These things again tell their own tale. They show that our writer, when returning to *Hom.* 21 and copying from it, filled in out of the context. Then, moreover, while it is quite conceivable that our writer might have treated as he has done Antiochus' ἀπερισπάστως καὶ εὐπαρέδρως, which is taken from 1 Cor. vii. 35 (εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ ἀπερισπάστως), it is impossible that our writer's language should have suggested the use of the text to Antiochus. Having used ver. 34, Antiochus proceeds to use ver. 35, which is natural enough; and with these verses he joins part of 1 Cor. vi. 17 ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἓν πνεῦμά ἐστι. This combination should be specially observed, because its source will be pointed out directly.

Following the passage just quoted from *Hom.* 21 are a few lines which are not represented in our Epistles. Antiochus then says:—

Ἀγώνισαι νομίμως ἀθλῆσαι, ἵνα τὸν στέφανον, ὃν ᾔρετίσω, ἀπολαύῃς, καὶ στεφανηφόρος πομπεύσῃς (so also Tilman, *v.l.* ἀπέλθῃς) πρὸς τὴν ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ. He uses Wisd. iv. 2 παροῦσάν τε μιμοῦνται αὐτήν, καὶ ποθοῦσιν ἀπελθοῦσαν (obs. *v.l.* above), καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι στεφανηφοροῦσα πομπεύει, τὸν τῶν ἀμιάντων ἄθλων ἀγῶνα νικήσασα.

Cf. "Nostin" sicut vir in hunc agonem legitime descendere atque certare, cum hoc in virtute spiritus eligis, ut coroneris corona lucis teque (triumphantem, Funk), circumducant per *Jerusalem supernam?* —*Ep.* i. 5.

The passages are plainly the same.

We are fortunately able to give quite decisive proof that Antiochus did not derive his use of Wisd. iv. 2 from our Epistles. We can produce the source from which he got not only that text, but the combination of 1 Cor. vii. 34 with chap. vi. 17 pointed out above. We shall make some extracts from *Hom.* 21, and place opposite to them parallel passages out of Antonius Melissa, *Loci Communes*, pars I. *Sermo* 14. The order of the passages as they stand in the

homily will be observed, while those from Anton. Mel. will be numbered:—

Antiochus.	Antonius Melissa.
μέγα οὖν ὡς ἀληθῶς τὸ κτῆμα τῆς παρθενίας . . . ταύτῃ ἀντοφθαλμῆσαι . . . ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ἐξουσίαν κατὰ τοῦ διαβόλου, εὐχερῶς ἐξανύεται παντὶ τῷ βουλομένῳ· τοιαύτη τῆς παρθενίας ἡ ἀρετή . . . . . (*vid. sup.* p. 48), καθαρῶς καὶ ἀμιάντως ἀρέσκουσα τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ἀεὶ μεριμνῶσα πῶς ἀρέσει αὐτῷ, καὶ ἓν πνεῦμα ἐστὶν πρὸς κύριον. . . . . . εἰ εὐνουχίσαι ἑαυτὸν ἠθέλησας διὰ τὴν αἰώνιον βασιλείαν . . . ὥσπερ κυβερνήτης τὰ κύματα διαβαίνων· γενοῦ ἡνιοχούμενος . . . . ἀγώνισαι νομίμως ἀθλῆσαι, ἵνα τὸν στέφανον ὃν ᾑρετίσω, ἀπολαύῃς, καὶ στεφανηφόρος πομπεύσῃς πρὸς τὴν ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ . . . μέγα οὖν ἐστιν ἐν ἁγνείᾳ μένειν εἰς τὴν τιμὴν τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἐν ἀκαυχησίᾳ· ἐὰν γὰρ καυχήσεται, ἀπώλετο· Χρὴ δὲ καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς ἀρετάς, καθὼς εἴρηται, ἀναλόγως ἔχειν τῇ παρθενίᾳ. . . . Χρὴ οὖν πάσῃ φυλακῇ[1] τηρεῖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ καρδίαν, καὶ μηδ' ὅλως συνδυάζειν παρθένον μετὰ νεανίσκου τὸ παράπαν· εἰ δὲ καὶ εὑρεθῶσιν πρεσβύτιδες ἱεροπρεπεῖς, καὶ χρεία παραθέσεως, εἰλῆσαι τὰς ἑαυτῶν χεῖρας τῷ ἑαυτῶν ἱματίῳ. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες, μετὰ αἰδοῦς ὀρθῶς βλέποντες σωφρόνως τε καὶ σεμνῶς ἐν κυρίῳ, τὰς ἑαυ-	(16) παρθενείας ζυγὸν μηδενί. ἐπιτίθει· ἐπισφαλὲς γὰρ τὸ κτῆμα . . (20) ὁ ἀντοφθαλμῶν ἡδοναῖς. . . . (21) . . . ἕως ἐστί σοι δύναμις κράτει τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν ἀρετή. ἐὰν γὰρ ἀδυναμία σε παύσῃ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τῆς ἀσθενείας ἡ χάρις. Ἐπαινοῦμεν δὲ τοὺς κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἀγαθοὺς . . . (13) 1 Cor. vii. 33, 34: . . . ὁμοίως καὶ ἡ ἄγαμος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, πῶς ἀρέσει τῷ κυρίῳ· . . (14) 1 Cor. vi. 15, 17: . . ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἓν πνεῦμά ἐστιν. . . . (2) S. Matt. xix. 12: εἰσὶν εὐνοῦχοι κ.τ.λ. . . . . (23) δεῖ οὖν τὸν νοῦν ὥσπερ τινὰ κυβερνήτην . . . . . καταπατεῖν μὲν γενναίως τὰ κύματα. . . . (32) ὁ τῶν παθῶν ἡνίοχος. . . . (19) καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι στεφανηφοροῦσα πομπεύει, τὸν τῶν ἀμιάντων ἄθλων ἀγῶνα νικήσασα. . . . . (15) Ignat. *ad Polyc.* 5: εἴ τις δύναται ἐν ἁγνείᾳ μένειν εἰς τιμὴν τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ κυρίου, ἐν ἀκαυχησίᾳ μενέτω. . . . . (31) χλεύη τὰ μὲν τῆς παιδοποιίας ὄργανα τηρεῖν παρθένα, τὴν δὲ γλῶσσαν μὴ τηρεῖν· ἢ τὴν γλῶσσαν μὲν τηρεῖν παρθένον, τὴν δὲ ὅρασιν ἢ τὴν ἀκοὴν ἢ τὰς χεῖρας μὴ τηρεῖν· ἢ ταῦτα μὲν ἔχειν καὶ τηρεῖν παρθένα, τὴν δὲ καρδίαν μὴ τηρεῖν, ἀλλ' ἑταιρίζεσθαι τύφῳ καὶ θυμῷ. . . . . . (33) ὁ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ θεραπεύων γαστέρα, καὶ πνεῦμα πορνείας νικῆσαι θέλων, ὅμοιός ἐστι τῷ μετὰ ἐλαίου σβεννύοντι ἐμπρησμόν . . . . .

[1] Prov. iv. 23 *πάσῃ φυλακῇ τήρει σὴν καρδίαν.* . . . ver. 25 *οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου ὀρθὰ βλεπέτωσαν.* . . . ver. 27 *μὴ ἐκκλίνῃς εἰς τὰ δεξιά κ.τ.λ.* Cf. Antiochus' *ὀρθῶς βλέποντες* and *τὰς δεξιάς* below. For parallel in *Ep.* ii. 2, *vid. inf.* p. 75.

τῶν δεξιὰς περικεκαλυμμένας ἔχοντες τῷ ἑαυτῶν ἱματίῳ, ἀποχωρισθῶσιν. Πρὸ δὲ πάντων χρὴ τὴν παρθένον τῷ ἐλαίῳ τῆς εὐποιίας κατακοσμῆσαι τὴν ἑαυτῆς λαμπάδα κ.τ.λ.

(39) τράπεζαν πολυτελῆ μὲν τύχη παρατίθησιν, αὐτάρκη δὲ σωφροσύνη.

It would require a strong belief in *accidental* coincidences to argue that the coincidences here are due to accident. It is out of the question to suppose that Anton. Mel. borrowed from Antiochus. There are only 129 lines in *Hom.* 21 (Migne's edition). There are 46 excerpts in the *Sermo* (Migne's edition), and they average about $3\frac{1}{2}$ lines each. If allowance is made for broken lines, there is less Greek in the *Sermo* than in the homily. Excerpts 11, 12 include fifteen verses from 1 Cor. vii. that are in no way touched in *Hom.* 21. Of the twelve excerpts in col. 809, eight (13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23) seem to be used. Of these 13, 14 (1 Cor. vii. 34 and c. vi. 17) are used by Antiochus in the same sentence; 15 is an excerpt from Ignatius, which Antiochus brings in with his own *μέγα οὖν*; 16 is apparently attributed to Ignatius, though not found in his Epistles, and is introduced also with *μέγα οὖν*; 19 is Wisd. iv. 1, 2; 20 is Ecclus. xix. 5, not quoted by Antiochus, who however uses *ἀντοφθαλμεῖν* here and nowhere else in his homilies (the word is by no means a common one); 21, 23 are excerpts from Basil.

But as a curiosity the close of *Hom.* 21, when compared with the *Sermo*, is perhaps the most remarkable part of it. Excerpt 31 is from Chrysostom, and the sentences of Antiochus placed opposite read like conclusions drawn from it. Chrysostom speaks of "keeping the heart," and so does Antiochus; of "keeping the hands," and so does Antiochus; of "keeping the eyes," and so does Antiochus. Excerpt 32 is only $2\frac{1}{2}$ lines in length, and is apparently used above. In No. 33 Climacus likens the man who desires to overcome lust without putting restraint upon the appetites to one who casts oil upon a flame. That may be, Antiochus seems to say, but "the oil of well-doing" is nevertheless effectual. With *χρεία παραθέσεως* cf. *παρατίθησιν* in par. 39.

To some of our readers the kind of literary work which this appears to be—the taking a quotation (as here from Ignatius) from a commonplace writer, and then joining with

it scraps and ideas borrowed from excerpts found in the same place—may seem strange and novel. It is, however, quite common with writers of a certain kind. We could give other examples out of Antiochus (for one or two on a smaller scale *vid. inf.* pp. 82, 96). We could produce out of a writing unsuspectingly read as from the pen of a voluminous writer of great note a piece of Greek of about twenty-five lines, which contains one after the other two passages, one from a Greek historian, the other from a Greek orator, and which are found following one another in a commonplace writer. In the remainder of the twenty-five lines each phrase or thought is founded on some one of the short excerpts from many authors given in the same place. This is a literal fact which, if it were pointed out, nobody would question.

To return to Antiochus. It is probable that it will be suggested that Antonius Melissa has here borrowed, as his custom was, from an earlier collector. This is true. He has borrowed from Maximus (*Serm.* 3, p. 536) very many of his excerpts, but not all. Maximus has not excerpts 13, 14, 15, 16, 21, 32, 33, 39, all of which appear to be used by Antiochus. Antonius Melissa lived in the twelfth century, as is supposed. The coincidences therefore between this *Sermo* and *Hom.* 21 are unquestionably awkward. It will be suggested, perhaps, that there was some earlier commonplace writer to whom both Maximus and Antonius were indebted, and from whom Antiochus borrowed. We do not intend to find any solution of the difficulty. The question does not concern us. We have proved all that we desired to prove. We have proved that Antiochus did not get his use together of 1 Cor. vii. 34 and 1 Cor. vi. 17, and of Wisd. iv. 2, from the Epistles to Virgins, but from another source. That is to say, we have proved that in *Hom.* 21, when compared with these Epistles, their author and not Antiochus was the copyist.

The close relationship between the *Homilies* of Antiochus and the Epistles to Virgins has now been proved beyond contradiction. But it has been also proved, by the comparison of many passages of these Epistles with the language of Antiochus, that he was not the copyist. Everywhere the same phenomena are found, and it is manifest that the writer

of the Epistles has filled out the language of the *Homilies* to suit his own purposes, and to give them that special tone which has seemed so ancient to editors and critics. It will not be forgotten that Antiochus borrowed from the same pages of Jerome as our writer, and independently of him, nor that the three versions of some sections of *Ep.* ii. (*vid. sup.* p. 43), on comparison, suggest that Jerome's was the earliest, Antiochus' next in order, and our writer's third. We conclude, therefore, that the Epistles to Virgins were written after the *Homilies*. A considerable number of passages from these Epistles will be compared with Antiochus in the next chapter, and pains will be taken to show that the conclusion now arrived at is sound.

4. The time has now come for the examination of the MS. in which Cureton found the extract from the "First Epistle on Virginity by Clement of Rome." While the relations subsisting between our Epistles and Antiochus were so far in doubt as that it was not clear that Antiochus was not the copyist, this could not be so profitably done. Hardly any of the contents of the MS. have been published, consequently it is not possible to do more, or very little more, than compare the Epistle and *Hom.* 21 with the excerpt as it stands in Cureton's volume. The indications, therefore, from which any judgment can be formed as to how the extract found its way into the two writings in which now we find it, must necessarily be slight. Funk, in his note to the passage as it stands in his translation, gives a Latin version of it as it is found in Cureton's MS., and says "Quæ verba si cum iis comparaveris, quæ in textu leguntur, ea ab illis paulum (in his text he puts a clause of sixteen words in brackets which he supposes has dropped out) discrepare haud te fugiet. Beelen (p. liv.) contendit, fragmentum particulam esse versionis diversæ ab ea, quæ hic editur, sed res non certa est. Auctor fragmenti locum aut parum accurate e memoria allegavit aut ipse vertit" (p. 5).

First Epistle to Virgins.

Num intellegis et nosti, quam sit res honorabilis castimonia? Num intellegis, quam magna, quam excellens sit gloria virginitatis? VI. Uterus sanctæ virginis gestavit Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, Dei filium, et corpus, quod Dominus noster gessit et quo certamen

suum fecit in hoc mundo, ex sancta virgine induerat. Hinc ergo intellege præstantiam et claritatem virginitatis. Vin' tu esse Christianus? Christum ergo imitare in omnibus.—*Ep.* i. 5 sq.

The Syriac MS.

Of the Same (Ignatius).

Permit ye me to be an imitator of the suffering of my God.—*Rom.* 6.

Of Polycarp.—. . . in all meekness.—C. 12.

Of Clement, Bishop of Rome, from the First Epistle on Virginity.

Understandest thou then what honour chastity requires? Knowest thou then with what glory virginity has been glorified? The womb of the Virgin bare our Lord Jesus Christ, God the Word; and when our Lord was made man by the Virgin, with this conduct did He conduct Himself in the world. By this thou mayest know the glory of virginity.

Of the Same, from the beginning of the Third Epistle.

My brethren, thus it behoveth us to think (φρονεῖν) concerning Jesus Christ, as concerning God, as concerning the Judge of the living and the dead. And it is not right for us to think (φρονεῖν) small things concerning our salvation; for by our thinking (φρονεῖν) small things concerning it, we also expect to receive small things, etc.—*Corp. Ignat.* p. 244.

Antiochus.

Μέγα οὖν ἐστιν ἐν ἁγνείᾳ μένειν εἰς τὴν τιμὴν τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἐν ἀκαυχησίᾳ. ἐὰν γὰρ καυχήσηται, ἀπώλετο (Ignat. *ad Polyc.* 5) χρὴ δὲ καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς ἀρετάς, καθὼς εἴρηται, ἀναλόγως ἔχειν τῇ παρθενίᾳ. ὅτι ἡ παρθενία ἀνωτέρα πάντων ἐστίν. Παρθένος γὰρ μήτρα ἐκύησε τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον. ἐκ τούτου γνῶθι τὴν δόξαν τῆς παρθενίας. Οἱ γὰρ ἀφιερούμενοι τῷ Θεῷ, μιμηταὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γίνονται· φησὶν γάρ· "Μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε, καθὼς κἀγὼ Χριστοῦ." Ἐν γὰρ τοῖς τοιούτοις φρονήμασιν, φρόνημα σαρκὸς οὐχ ὑπάρχει.—*Hom.* 21.

παρ' ἡμῖν δὲ τοῖς Χριστιανοῖς. . . . ἀφ' οὗ γὰρ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸς ηὐδόκησεν ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας ἀχράντου Θεοτόκου, καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας τῷ κόσμῳ ἐπιφανῆναι.—*Hom.* 21 (earlier).

It will be seen here that the language of Antiochus is in some respects (*e.g.* τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον) nearer to the excerpt than that of our Epistle; while the "Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum Dei filium" of the Epistle appears earlier in *Hom.* 21. It will be seen too that there are coincidences here, between *Hom.* 21 and Timotheus, of the same kind as those which were just now pointed out with Anton. Mel. For here, as in Timotheus, Ignatius is quoted, while the language of

Ignatius (and his well-known character), cited above the excerpt, might well give rise to Antiochus' remark, that "they who are consecrated to God become imitators of Christ, for he says (*φησὶν γάρ*), 'Be ye imitators of me as I also am of Christ,'" where the *φησὶν γὰρ* may be almost thought to be put into the mouth of Ignatius. It is again almost impossible to suppose that Antiochus' *ἐν γὰρ τοῖς τοιούτοις φρονήμασιν* is anything else than a glance at the three times repeated *φρονεῖν* of the excerpt, which professes to have been taken from Clement's Third Epistle, and which is now found in the Second Epistle to the Corinthians.

The language from the earlier part of *Hom.* 21 quoted above may moreover be fitly compared with the heading of that part of Timotheus' work in which the excerpt is found:—"Many proofs of the holy Fathers, which show that the Virgin is the mother of God, and that Jesus Christ is true God, and that He is one and the same Son who of God the Father was divinely confessed, and of the Holy Virgin by taking of the flesh was written among the generations, and that by the birth of the Word in the flesh He submitted to suffering and death, and that Christ Himself is the Word of God" (*Corp. Ignat.* p. 243). The words recall to mind the language of the "Magnificat," and accordingly Antiochus proceeds to quote some verses from this hymn.

It is of course not affirmed that Antiochus used the very MS. out of which Cureton took the excerpts cited above. He may have used the actual work of Timotheus in a separate form. Or, again, he may have used a MS. in many respects like to Cureton's. There is a strong family likeness amongst many of these Syriac MSS. Thus if we turn over one leaf in the *Corpus Ignatianum* we find, as "From the book of my Lord the holy Severus, patriarch of Antioch, against the wicked Grammaticus," four excerpts which are quoted also by Timotheus—three of them being the three given above in company with the excerpt from our Epistle. Antiochus *may* have used a MS. resembling the one used by Cureton, for this MS. contains a "Summary of Heresies by Epiphanius" (*Corp. Ignat.* p. 353), and in *Hom.* 130 Antiochus gives a careful summary of these, at the end of which he adds *ἕως τῶν ὧδε ὁ ἅγιος Ἐπιφάνιος ἐξέθετο.* He proceeds to give

other names, and presently Eutyches and his followers, Dioscorus, Theodosius, Gaianus, Timotheus Ælurus, Peter, and others. It is natural, therefore, to suppose that he was acquainted with the class of writings to which this MS. belongs.

But while these things are so, it must nevertheless be observed that the language of our Epistle is in some respects also nearer to the excerpt than that of Antiochus. Our writer's question too, "Vin' tu esse Christianus? Christum ergo imitare in omnibus," looks very much like an independent glance at the familiar history of Ignatius or Polycarp, and which would be easily suggested by the excerpts from Ignatius and Polycarp which stand above the excerpt from the "First Epistle on Virginity." These facts resemble those which have already appeared in the case of Jerome, whose language was used both by our writer and Antiochus. The question, however, whether our writer trod in the steps of Antiochus, or whether he was the same person as the writer of *Hom.* 21, is not one that we feel in the least called upon to discuss. Our subject is "Modern Criticism and the Epistles to Virgins," and on the question here raised modern criticism has not yet declared itself. At any rate, and this is all that concerns us, the excerpt found by Cureton in a work by Timotheus of Alexandria against the Council of Chalcedon was not taken from the Epistles to Virgins now in our hands.

The results of the foregoing inquiry into the external testimony to the Epistles to Virgins may be now briefly summed up.

The authorities relied upon by editors and critics have been Epiphanius, Jerome, and Timotheus of Alexandria. It has been shown that neither Epiphanius nor Jerome had any knowledge of the Epistles to Virgins now in our hands, and that the Epistles of Clement, mentioned by these Fathers, were probably the two known in the Church as the Epistles to the Corinthians, with which, however, these Fathers were not acquainted otherwise than at second hand. It has been further shown that while Timotheus of Alexandria (or whoever else was the author of the work ascribed to Timotheus) unquestionably made an extract which purports to have been

taken from the "First Epistle on Virginity by Clement, bishop of Rome," he nevertheless did not take that excerpt from the First Epistle now in our hands. The whole external evidence, therefore, on which editors and critics have relied to prove the authenticity, or perhaps rather antiquity, of the Epistles to Virgins has completely broken down. In its room, however, the valuable and reliable testimony of Antiochus Palæstinensis has been produced, in whose *Homilies* whole sections of both Epistles have been found. The evidence which his pages, when carefully examined, undesignedly supply proves that the Epistles to Virgins were written after the *Homilies*. A great deal of evidence leading to the same conclusion will be furnished in the next chapter.

For the greater convenience of our readers all the passages from the Epistles, which are compared in the present work with the *Homilies* of Antiochus, are reprinted in the Appendix in their proper order.

CHAPTER II.

"I think I have pointed out the infallible touchstone of supposed antiquity. I premise a few general rules on that point, namely, of the evidence to be received in such cases."—*The Antiquary.*

It is proposed in this chapter to examine some of the deductions which the learned criticism of the present day has drawn from the contents of the Epistles to Virgins as to their author, and the indications which this author has unconsciously (as is supposed) given of the country to which he belonged, the times in which he lived, and the scenes of Church life and development which were everywhere around him as he wrote. If, on the whole, this chapter should read like a revised version of the *Comedy of Errors,* there may still come forth some lessons to bear fruit in the future. It may be well for once to see whether the sober conservative criticism that is ready to believe everything that professes to be ancient, and to become the ardent upholder and eloquent expositor of writings the claims of which to antiquity it has never examined, is after all so much more worthy of the confidence of those who in such matters are obliged to depend upon the opinions of their fellow-men, than the wild and reckless criticism which is ready to abandon everything. The question may perhaps arise whether there is not room for a school of critics which exists even now, but which might be larger in dimensions than at present, which shall not be afraid to bring to bear upon all matters relating to ecclesiastical literature those principles of prudent caution which everywhere prevail in common life, and which shall spend its strength not so much in reviewing and rearranging the learned criticisms of its predecessors as in independent research for itself.

§ 1.

Dr. Lightfoot, and with him the majority of critics, deny that the Epistles to Virgins were written by Clement of

Rome. This is a bold denial in the face of the facts as they understand them. The authorship of Clement is witnessed to by the scribe of the 1470 MS., by the scribe of the MS. which Cureton found, by (as they suppose) Epiphanius, and again by Jerome. Thus the whole of the external testimony known to critics is in favour of the authorship of Clement. Dr. Lightfoot, however, throws it overboard in a contented spirit, though when occasion suits him he will plead the great weight of the testimony of only one scribe, and this one, curious to relate, one of the two named above, the scribe that wrote Cureton's MS. Our readers may like to know the exact numerical value which Dr. Lightfoot sets upon the testimony of this scribe.

The author of *Supernatural Religion* was rash enough to question the authenticity of certain fragments ascribed to Melito, and found by Cureton in the same[1] MS. as the extract from the First Epistle on Virginity. He ventured to assert that these fragments "have in fact no attestation whatever except that of the Syriac translation, which is unknown, and which therefore is worthless." To this very sweeping assertion Dr. Lightfoot replied in the *Contemp. Rev.*, Feb. 1876 :—

"The fact is that in a very vast number of literary remains, classical and ecclesiastical, whether excerpts or entire works, we are entirely dependent on the scribe for their authentication. Human experience has shown that such authentication is generally trustworthy, and hence it is accepted. In forty-nine cases out of fifty, or probably more, it is found to be satisfactory, and *à priori* probabilities are very strongly against the assumption that any particular case is this fiftieth exception. If there is substantial ground for suspicion, the suspicion has its weight, but not otherwise. A man who would act on any other principle is as unreasonable as a visitor to London who refuses to believe or trust any one there, because the place is known to harbour thieves and liars" (p. 484).

[1] "The four following extracts (from Melito) are taken from one of the Syriac MSS. brought from Nitria, now in the British Museum, No. 12,156, f. 70. 76, 77, written A.D. 562. As I have already given a description of this MS. in my *Corpus Ignatianum*, p. 352, it is needless for me to repeat it here." Cureton *Spic. Syr.* p. 95, London 1855. In *Corp. Ignat.* p. 352 sq., Cureton says that the MS. containing Timotheus' work against the Council of Chalcedon is a "large quarto written in three columns," and known as "Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 12,156," and that the extracts which he gives on pp. 210 sq. (Syriac), 243 sq. (English) are found in "fol. 1 and fol. 69." The extracts, quoted by us above on p. 54, will therefore be on "fol. 69."

Let us apply this arithmetic to the case of the Epistles to Virgins. In the case of the fragments of Melito there was only one scribe to be considered, and the accuracy of this scribe is not to be lightly challenged, as we have just heard. In the case of our Epistles we have *this same scribe*, also the scribe of the A.D. 1470 MS., also the two scribes of the MSS. which Epiphanius and Jerome had in their hands, the judgment of these last being supported by the learning of these Fathers. The odds in favour of each of these scribes are 49 to 1. The chances that four such scribes, in four different ages of the Church, in four different parts of the world, and writing in more languages than one, were all in error, must surely be infinitesimally small. Wetstein and those who with him believe in the authorship of Clement stand, one would suppose, in an impregnable position. When the shipmen "cast out the wheat into the sea" it was probably with sadness that so much good food should be wasted. At any rate the fact is recorded. But Dr. Lightfoot heaves overboard the fourfold testimony, apparently without a shade of regret, and at any rate without a word as to "*à priori* probabilities," or the rights and claims of a "fiftieth exception." Yet when the author of *Supernatural Religion* suggests that the authentication of the scribe in the case of the Melitonian fragments is worthless, he is brought sharply to book, and told that an authentication which is worthless in the case of the Epistles to Virgins is most valuable as applied to the fragments. It is about the most amusing piece of critical inconsistency that it has been our good fortune to come across. Dr. Lightfoot reads through the Epistles to Virgins, and does not like them as the work of Clement. They do not square with the picture of the very earliest times which his fancy has painted, and so he rejects them, and these four scribes are allowed to testify in vain. He reads the Melitonian fragments, and he likes them. He can fit them into his picture. He can find some support in them for the books of the New Testament; and so the scribe's word is to be relied upon, and the scribe is nevertheless one of the four just rejected. The author of *Supernatural Religion* reads the same fragments, and since they will not fit into his

picture, and will not support his theories, he condemns them and pronounces the scribe's authority worthless. Where is the real difference between these two critics? Is such a method of dealing with documents worthy of the name of criticism? For let it be observed there is as much to be learned about the Melitonian fragments as there is about the Epistles to Virgins, if only a little trouble is taken in the matter. But Dr. Lightfoot will say, no doubt, that in his opinion he had good reasons for rejecting in the one case and for accepting in the other. Of course he had, and so had the author of *Supernatural Religion* in his own estimation. He too might have explained the scribe's error. He might have pleaded, with Dr. Lightfoot, wrong ascription on the part of the scribe, through a predecessor's error (*Contemp. Rev.* as before, p. 486), or displacement of memoranda (Light. p. 459), or mistake (Light. p. 16). There is no difficulty in inventing such explanations. What we want to make plain is that all this criticism, whether at the hands of the author of *Supernatural Religion* or his opponent, is purely arbitrary, and rests upon no fixed principle. There is not an atom of difference between the two methods. Neither the one critic nor the other seeks for the evidence by which his opinion, dogmatically pronounced, may be substantiated. The only difference is, and it is a material one, the one is fighting for the Church, and in the opinion of many cannot be wrong, the other against it, and therefore cannot be right.

Let us hear the reasons which Dr. Lightfoot gives for rejecting Clement as the author of our Epistles:—

> The lame arguments urged in many cases by their impugners have given to their advocates almost the appearance of a victory; but weighty objections against them still remain, unanswered and unanswerable. To say nothing of the style, which differs from that of the true Clement, the manner and frequency of the quotations from the New Testament, and the picture presented of the life and development of the Church, do not accord with the genuine epistle and point to a later age. For these reasons the Epistles to Virgins can hardly have been written before the middle of the second century. At the same time they bear the stamp of high antiquity, and in the opinion of some competent writers (*e.g.* Westcott, *Canon* p. 162, Hefele in *Wetzer u. Welte's Kirchen-Lexicon* ii. p. 586) cannot be placed much later than this date. As they seem to have emanated from Syria, and the Syrian Church changed less rapidly than the

Greek or the Western, it is perhaps safer to relax the limits of the possible date to the beginning of the third century.

A champion of the Epistles would not, we imagine, find much difficulty in supplying an answer to these objections. He would say that Epiphanius must be a far better[1] judge whether the picture of church life drawn in these Epistles is consistent or not with the earliest times than any nineteenth century critic whatever. The literature of the times of Clement has all but perished out of sight.

§ 2.

Dr. Lightfoot considers that our Epistles emanated from Syria. He does not give the reason for this conjecture, but it will be found elsewhere. In *Canon*, p. 184 (4th ed.), Dr. Westcott discusses the question of the quotations from Holy Scripture found in our Epistles, and points out that there are none "out of St. Mark, 2 Peter, 2, 3 John, Jude, and the Apocalypse," and proceeds:—

> If the writer had been acquainted with the Apocalypse he could hardly have failed to quote such a passage as xiv. 4, which has the closest connexion with his argument.
>
> In general it will be observed that (with the obviously accidental omission of St. Mark and Philemon) quotations are made from every book included in the Syrian Canon, and from these only. The fact is significant, and probably points to the country whence the Epistles derived their origin, though it is clear from internal evidence that they were originally written in Greek.

The conjecture, whether true or false, rests on no sufficient basis. First, because Rev. xiv. 4 is not at all uncommonly omitted when "it has the closest connexion with the writer's argument." Tertullian quotes it in *De Resurrectione Carnis*, but, if the index may be trusted, nowhere else. Pseudo-Athanasius, Basil, and Gregory Nyssen have treatises *De Virginitate*, but do not appear to use the text. It is not quoted in connection with virginity either by John of Damascus or

[1] Which would be the better judge of the consistency of a novel, the plot of which is laid two centuries ago, the critic of to-day in the midst of a sufficient literature, or the critic of fourteen centuries hence when, let us suppose, the whole literature of the present and past will have disappeared except a few remains, chiefly fragments, none of which deal expressly with the manners and customs of the period to which the plot of the novel belongs?

Antonius Melissa. Many other examples might be given. The inference drawn from the omission of the text is quite unwarrantable, not to mention that Funk supposes, and apparently with justice, that Rev. xii. 7 is used in *Ep.* i. 5.

In the next place, the writer of our Epistles does use the Epistle of S. Jude (*vid. inf.* p. 72).

Lastly, the whole argument breaks down, because nothing can be safely determined from a writer's neglect of certain books of the New Testament. Antiochus Palæstinensis does not quote Rev. xiv. 4 in its proper or any connection, and does not quote 2, 3 John, but he does quote 2 Peter (often) and Jude. The non-quotation of 2, 3 John and the Apocalypse (except in one instance, that pointed out by Funk, and mentioned above) is beyond measure more remarkable in the case of Antiochus' *Homilies* with their hundreds of texts, than the non-quotation in our Epistles of the books of the New Testament pointed out by Dr. Westcott—even if he were right in including Jude — while Antiochus' quotation of 2 Peter and Jude proves that nothing can be concluded from that non-quotation.

§ 3.

But though Dr. Lightfoot is thus governed in his estimate of the date to which our Epistles should be ascribed by his conjecture as to the place to which their writer belonged—a conjecture which, whether true or false, rests on no certain basis—he takes no account whatever of a matter which is of principal importance, and as to which there is no manner of doubt. It does not seem to have occurred to him that the author who, as he considers, imitated the expressions and adopted the favourite words of the true Clement, would as a matter of course endeavour to give some verisimilitude to his work. To suppose that this person would copy into his work the picture of church life which he saw every day around him, and then think that the imitation of a few expressions proper to the genuine Clement would give his Epistles a sufficient resemblance to the times of Clement, is beyond measure unreasonable. Yet this is the line taken by the greatest critics of the day. "They (the Epistles) cannot I believe be much later

than the middle of the second century, and it is hardly probable that they are much earlier. The picture of Christian life which they draw belongs to a very early age," says Dr. Westcott. "Competent judges have assigned these Epistles to the middle of the second century, but their arguments hardly suffice to exclude a somewhat later date," says the writer of the article in Smith and Wace, *Dict. Christ. Biog.* "The Epistles to Virgins, ascribed as early as SS. Epiphanius and Jerome to St. Clement of Rome, are now thought likely to be of about this date (times of Melito)," says Mr. Simcox, *Beginnings of Christian Church*, p. 389. These critics have documents in their hands which they believe to be spurious,—one of them believes further that their author, for the purpose of deception, imitated the language of the genuine Clement,—and yet they handle these dangerous documents with all the unsuspiciousness, to use an illustration which we should not have ventured upon if it had not been palpably suggested by the language of Dr. Lightfoot himself (*vid. sup.* p. 59), with all the unsuspiciousness of a country visitor in one of the mock auction rooms in London. And that which makes this unsuspiciousness the more amazing is the fact that *Ep.* i. 6 contains an obvious trap, into which Cardinal Clement Villecourt falls with a simplicity so charming as to relax for the moment the features of the gravest critic.

In *Ep.* i. 6 our writer says:—

Christum ergo imitare in omnibus. Joannes legatus, qui ante Dominum nostrum venit, *quo major quisquam non fuit inter natos ex mulieribus*, sanctus Domini nostri nuntius, virgo fuit. Imitare ergo Domini nostri legatum, et esto amicus ejus in omnibus. Deinde Joannes, *qui super pectus Domini nostri recubuit, quem valde diligebat*, is quoque virgo fuit; neque enim sine causa[1] Dominus noster illum diligebat. Paulus quoque et Barnabas et Timotheus cum

υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος . . . ὡς οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ φίλοι· ζήλωσον αὐτῶν τὴν πολιτείαν, γίνου ὡς ὁ Ἰωάννης, ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πρόδρομος, ὁ ἅγνὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἄγγελος, καὶ ὡς ὁ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπιστήθιος τοῦ κυρίου, ὃν καὶ ἐφίλει ὁ κύριος ὡς ἁγνόν. Παῦλος, καὶ Βαρνάβας, καὶ Τιμόθεος, τὸν δρόμον τῆς ἁγνείας, καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα, ἄσπιλον ἐτέλεσαν, ὡς ἀληθῶς μιμηταὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἠλιού,

[1] Cf. Jer. *adv. Jovin.* i. 26, p. 279 "Si autem obnixe contenderit, Joannem virginem non fuisse, et nos amoris præcipui causam virginitatem diximus, exponat ille, si virgo non fuit, cur cæteris Apostolis plus amatus sit?"—*Vid. inf.* p. 66, note.

reliquis aliis, *quorum nomina scripta sunt in libro vitæ*, hi, inquam, omnes castimoniam dilexerunt atque amarunt et in isthoc certamine cucurrerunt cursumque suum immaculate confecerunt ut Christi imitatores et tamquam filii Dei vivi. Set et Eliam et Elisæum aliosque multos viros sanctos invenimus vitam egisse cælibem atque immaculatam. His igitur si cupis similis fieri, fortiter illos imitare ; dixit enim : *Seniores vestros honorate, cumque eorum vitæ rationem moresque videritis, fidem illorum imitemini.* Et iterum ait : *Imitemini me, fratres, sicut ego Christum.* VII. Illi ergo, qui Christum imitantur, strenue ipsum imitantur.

καὶ Ἐλισσαίου, καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν τὸν βίον τοιοῦτον εὑρήσεις, ἁγνόν, καὶ ἄμωμον. Εἰ οὖν τούτους θέλῃς μιμήσασθαι δυνατῶς, μιμοῦ πρεσβυτέρους, "Ὧν ἀναθεωροῦντες, φησίν, τὴν ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς, μιμήσασθε καὶ τὴν πίστιν." Καὶ τό· "Μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε, κἀγὼ Χριστοῦ." Οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μιμηταί, δυνατῶς μιμοῦνται αὐτόν· οἱ τοιοῦτοι καὶ μακάριοί εἰσιν.—*Hom.* 112.

Compare : "Virgines solum Christum præ oculis habete et ejus patrem in animabus vestris illuminatæ a spiritu sancto. Memor sum sanctitatis vestræ sicut Heliæ, sicut Jesu Nave, sicut Melchisedech, sicut Helisæi, sicut Hieremiæ, sicut Johannis Baptistæ, sicut dilectissimi discipuli, sicut Timothei, sicut Titi, sicut Euodii, sicut Clementis vel eorum, qui in castitate de vita exierunt. Non detraho autem ceteris beatis, qui nuptiis copulati fuerunt, quorum nunc memini . . . sicut Petrus et Paulus," etc.—Ignat. *ad Philad.* 4.

The connection between these two passages is so close that, whatever be the explanation, it is at least apparent that the "quorum nomina scripta sunt in libro vitæ" ("with Clement also, and with other my fellow-labourers, whose names are in the book of life," Phil. iv. 3) of the one is equivalent to the "sicut Clementis" of the other. Our *falsarius* was too clever to write with other pseudo-Clements, "I Clement." With becoming modesty he points to S. Paul's words, and leaves the reader to supply the name. It was a forger's device, a pitfall into which Cardinal Clement Villecourt goes headlong. "Hæc verba dulcia erant et in ore et sub calamo sancti Clementis, qui in hac Epistola sancti Pauli expresse inter electos nominatur. Seipsum vero sanctus pontifex præ modestia nominare non debuit. *Cum Clemente*, ait Apostolus, *et cæteris adjutoribus meis quorum nomina sunt in libro vitæ.* O prophetia beatitudinis, ore apostolico prolata ! Utinam involvas homonymum exsulem sorti beatæ patroni anhelantem !" The Cardinal believes devoutly in these Epistles on Virginity, and so clutches eagerly the treacherous hand which the forger holds out to him. "Surely in vain is the net spread in the sight

of any bird," is a saying which finds no illustration in the criticism on these Epistles. The Cardinal's fate has been no warning even to those who have smiled at his words.

It must now be observed how entirely the view that has been taken is borne out by the passage from Antiochus, *Hom.* 112, which is placed alongside of *Ep.* i. 6. Antiochus does not use the words "whose names are in the book of life," nor yet their equivalent, the name of Clement. Why should he not do so? It is easy to understand why our author should insert them. There are other omissions. Antiochus (though his *οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ φίλοι*, immediately before the mention of John, shows a glance at S. John iii. 29 *ὁ φίλος τοῦ νυμφίου*) does not speak of the Baptist as a friend, nor does he say that "none greater than John had been born of women." But these omissions may be supplied out of *Hom.* 21 (*de Virginitate*) where the Greek of the words just preceding the passage from *Ep.* i. 6 is found, as well as language which occurs in *Ep.* i. §§ 3, 5, 7, 8; ii. 2 (*vid. sup.* pp. 47–54, *inf.* p. 75). Antiochus there instances Elijah and Elisha, but not in the same words as in *Hom.* 112. He writes *τάχα δὲ καὶ Ἱερεμίαν*, to which Cotelier refers in the notes to which Funk directs his readers (*vid. sup.* p. 9), and adds *τὸν μέγαν ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν γενόμενον . . . ὃς . . . οὐ μόνον φίλος τοῦ νυμφίου ἐκλήθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν κατηξιώθη*[1] *βαπτίσαι τὸν κύριον.* If Antiochus knew the Epistles, he had them before his eyes in both *Homilies.* This is beyond contradiction. In *Hom.* 21, then, he very lightly touched the passage from *Ep.* i. 6, quoted above. In *Hom.* 112 he borrowed more extensively, but he omitted just those points which he had touched before. He could not have done it so exactly without trying to do it, which is perfectly incredible. To all appearance the author of our Epistles was the copyist, and carefully combined Antiochus' two passages on John Baptist, and wrote in the words "Whose names are in the book of life" with express intent to deceive. This conjecture is confirmed by the fact that our writer's "tamquam filii Dei vivi," though there is nothing answering to it in the *parallel*

[1] Cf. Jer. *adv. Jovin.* i. 26, p. 278 Sciat . . . ut a Propheta virgine, virgo Dominus et annuntiaretur, et baptizaretur (*vid. sup.* p. 64, note).

language of Antiochus, yet might have been filled in from his *υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος* earlier in *Hom.* 112.

§ 4.

In his reasons for rejecting the authorship of Clement, quoted above (p. 61), Dr. Lightfoot points to the manner and frequency of the quotations from the New Testament as being inconsistent with the genuine Epistle, and pointing to a later age. The language is too vague for us to deal with. Dr. Westcott fortunately is more precise in his statements. He (p. 184) says that "whole paragraphs of these Epistles are a mosaic of apostolic phrases," and that "some of the references to the Christian Scriptures are more explicit, though no book of the New Testament, nor yet of the Old, is mentioned by name," *e.g.* "the divine apostle," "words of the apostle," "sayings of Paul," "it is written," "we read." Dr. Westcott sees in this anonymous form of quotation a stamp of antiquity. It is one thing to say that very definite descriptions of books quoted is the mark of a late date,—which is not the argument here,—and quite another to urge that the anonymous form is the mark of antiquity. Of all tests that can be applied to ecclesiastical writings there is not one more fallacious. Funk (p. iii.), taking the line of Dr. Lightfoot, writes "Auctor epistulis multos S. Scripturæ locos tacite inserit, cum Clemens in epistula ad Corinthios, si orationem illam præstantissimam (c. 59–61) exceperis, fere semper indicat, ubi aliquid e S. Scriptura desumpsit." So then these discriminating critics reject the Epistles to Virgins as the work of Clement, because Clement does not quote anonymously; they place them a few years later, because their author does, this form, they suppose, having come into use; they place him no later, because, says Dr. Westcott, the anonymous form belongs to that period. What then is to be done with the treatise on Virginity, ascribed to Athanasius, where will be found "the divine Paul," "the holy Paul," "the apostle," "the Lord says," etc., and once "God says through Jeremiah," or with the *Oratio de S. Synaxi* of Anastasius, where the quotations are anonymous, for though the Book of Psalms is mentioned, it is not in immediate

connection with any text? What is to be done with the writings of Chrysostom, where one may be found with all the quotations anonymous, another with the mention of nearly all the books referred to, another with a very occasional mention? What is to be done with the chapters of Basil's *De Spiritu Sancto*, or the Homilies of John of Damascus, where some have the quotations altogether anonymous, others with the occasional mention of a book? If the anonymous form of quotation is a mark of antiquity, it has been in all ages very successfully imitated. Now it happens that in the *Homilies* of Antiochus the anonymous form is the rule, and the mention of a book the exception. Long strings of texts will be found without any mention of a book. There is no such mention in *Hom.* 21, where no small part of the language of these Epistles is found. Mostly when books are named, *e.g.* James, it is not that Antiochus names the book, but the writer whom he can no otherwise describe. The anonymous form of quotation is not a mark of antiquity. If, however, it is insisted upon, Antiochus, who wrote not earlier than A.D. 614, shares it with the Epistles to Virgins.

Dr. Westcott adds:—

> One indication of the early date of the Epistles may be noticed in addition to the anonymous form of the quotations. The enumeration of the primary authorities binding on the Christian is given in the form "the Law and the Prophets and the Lord Jesus Christ" (*Ep.* i. 12), just as it was given by Hegesippus, as we shall see afterwards. But while the formula witnesses to the antiquity of the record, the usage of the writer shows convincingly that it did not exclude the fullest recognition of the authority of St. Paul and of the Three.—P. 185.

Dr. Westcott here ventures to point to a sure mark of antiquity of a very definite kind. He finds in *Ep.* i. 12 the Holy Scriptures described by the formula "the Law and the Prophets and the Lord Jesus." He finds the same formula in a passage from Hegesippus quoted by Eusebius (*H. E.* iv. 22), and therefore concludes that our Epistles were of very early date. It is evident, however, that Dr. Westcott proves too much. How does he account for the coincidence? If he says it is accidental, inasmuch as the formula may be supposed to have been common in the times of Hegesippus

and therefore not unlikely to turn up at least once in the few remains of this writer's works which have come down to us, then the coincidence is of no value at all. For the formula must have taken some time to become common, and have afterwards remained in at least occasional use for a long period. It could not have come in and gone out again by the stroke of the clock (though critics do sometimes argue as though they supposed that there was of old some "Big Ben," the sound of which, throughout the Church, called on writers everywhere to change their methods of quotation, their picture of church life, and possibly their handwriting). Thus this particular formula never could have been common; for while all Christian writings speak more or less of Scripture, no other examples of it, we believe, than the two before us can be found. The coincidence in language is therefore exceedingly remarkable. If the formula had been found in an Epistle of St. Paul, no one who has studied the coincidences on which Dr. Westcott is wont to rely will deny that he would have duly placed Hegesippus as a witness to that Epistle in his *Synopsis of Historical Evidence* (p. 582 sq.). It is not in any of St. Paul's Epistles. Now it happens that Eusebius shows that Hegesippus had, shortly before using the formula, been discussing Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians, and also that he had about that time been brought much in contact with persons and places under the influence of Clement's teaching. There can be little question but that Dr. Westcott, if he believed that Clement was the author of our Epistles, would point to these things and say that Hegesippus borrowed the formula from Clement. He would be false to the principles on which his *Synopsis* is built up if he did not. We find our Epistles placed in this *Synopsis* as the first witness to 1 John on the strength of a coincidence of language between 1 John iv. 6 and *Ep.* ii. 16, which is certainly not more remarkable than the coincidence in the use of the formula in question. The Epistles, however, were not written by Clement in Dr. Westcott's judgment. He wants to place them about the times of Hegesippus, or, at any rate, long before the times of Eusebius. As the author of *Supernatural Religion* evades the force of the coincidences which are urged in proof of the authenticity of books of the New

Testament,—this is the charge which is brought against him, —so Dr. Westcott evades the force of the coincidence to which he appeals. The coincidence which under other circumstances would have proved dependence in this case is purely accidental, and a conspicuous mark of the high antiquity of the Epistles. But has Dr. Westcott never heard of that famous use of Eusebius (to which attention was called on p. 10 sq.), whereby pseudo-Ignatius sought, by the use of the language of Alexander of Jerusalem (as quoted by Eusebius) in his letter to the Church at Antioch, to impose his own letter to the Antiochians upon credulous readers as the veritable work of Ignatius? That noteworthy instance proves that the greatest possible caution is needed in dealing with striking coincidences between the remains of ancient authors preserved by Eusebius and writings the date of which is unknown. We have already seen the trap which our author, by his use of Phil. iv. 3, set for the steps of credulous souls, such as Cardinal Villecourt. Is there not something more than a possibility that the remarkable coincidence in language between our Epistle and the words of Hegesippus, as quoted by Eusebius, may be nothing else than a similar device, a device to catch the hasty verdict that the Epistles bear the stamp of high antiquity? The *Homilies* of Antiochus turn this possibility into an actual certainty.

The formula in question, with its context, stands thus in *Ep.* i. 12 sq.:—

Etenim pulcrum hoc est coram Deo et coram hominibus, ut scilicet recordemur pauperum et ut fratres atque peregrinos diligamus propter Deum et propter eos, qui credunt in Deum, sicut EX LEGE AC PROPHETIS ET A DOMINO NOSTRO JESU CHRISTO didicimus de cari-

Hom. 97. καλή ἐστιν ἡ φιλοξενία καὶ τῷ Θεῷ ἀρέσκουσα, μάλιστα δὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως. *Hom.* 98. Ἡ φιλοπτωχία καὶ ἡ φιλοξενία δύο κλάδοι εἰσὶν . . .[1] "Προνοοῦ καλὰ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων." *Hom.* 96. Ὁ ἀγαπῶν[2] τὸν πλησίον, μακράν ἐστιν ἀπὸ

[1] Part of the two texts the use of which in *Ep.* i. 2 is shown above (p. 45 sq.).

[2] Cf. ὅς (Παῦλος) καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολάς, εἰς ἃς ἐὰν ἐγκύπτητε, δυνηθήσεσθε οἰκοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν πίστιν (Jude 3, 20), ἥτις ἐστὶ μήτηρ πάντων ἡμῶν, ἐπακολουθούσης τῆς ἐλπίδος, προαγούσης τῆς ἀγάπης, τῆς εἰς Θεὸν καὶ Χριστὸν καὶ εἰς τὸν πλησίον. ἐὰν γάρ τις τούτων ἐντὸς ᾖ, πεπλήρωκεν ἐντολὴν δικαιοσύνης. ὁ γὰρ ἔχων ἀγάπην μακρὰν ἐστι πάσης ἁμαρτίας (Polyc. *Phil.* 3). The use of πίστις μήτηρ and ἐντός here is well illustrated in Anton. Mel. *Loc. Comm.* I. *Serm.* i. p. 3 sq. With Polycarp here and § 4, cf. Antioch. *Hom.* 114, and for ἐντός, *Hom.* 89.

tate erga fratres et peregrinos, propterea quod ipsum hoc jucundum est atque acceptum vobis; propterea quod *omnes* vos *edocti estis a Deo.* Nostis enim ea quæ dicta sunt verba de caritate erga fratres et peregrinos; potenter namque dicta sunt verba illa omnibus, qui ea faciunt. XIII. O fratres nostri dilecti. Etiam, quod quis ædificare debeat et confirmare fratres in fide unius Dei, manifestum est et notum.

πάσης ἁμαρτίας. Πᾶσα γὰρ Γραφὴ παλαιά τε καὶ νέα τοῦτο ἡμῖν παρακελεύεται, τὸ "Ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτόν." Δευτέραν γὰρ αὐτὴν μετὰ τὴν πρὸς Θεὸν ἀγάπην ὁ κύριος ἐντολὴν ἀπέδειξεν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου εἶναι . . . καὶ ὁ Πέτρος.[1] "Ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ τηρήσωμεν, προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κ. ἡ. Ἰ. Χ." . . . "Ὁ δὲ κύριος πλεονάσαι καὶ περισσεύσαι ἡμᾶς τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ εἰς ἀλλήλους, καὶ εἰς πάντας." Φησὶν δὲ καὶ ἄλλοις, "Περὶ δὲ τῆς φιλαδελφίας αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς θεοδίδακτοί ἐστε εἰς τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους." καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἀγαπήσωμεν τοὺς ὁμοπίστους ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.

We are privileged here to inspect the rough notes, as it were, from which the author of our Epistles worked. In idea the two passages are the same. There is in both what is intended to be an exhaustive description of the Bible, in the one case of the earlier, in the other of the later type. In both there is a reference to the "law" and to the teaching of Christ. Antiochus quotes S. Matt. xxii. 39. No one can help adding ver. 40 "*On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets,*" thus completing the formula of our Epistle. Both writers, the one fully, the other less so, quote 1 Thess. iv. 9. The εἰς πάντας· φησὶν δὲ καὶ ἄλλοις of Antiochus is turned into "dicta sunt verba illa omnibus" of our Epistle. The redundancy of language around 1 Thess. iv. 9 in our Epistle should be observed. Beelen suspected a gloss. There is more than one pleonasm. Our writer makes his words to abound towards all men. *Notice* the πλεονάσαι καὶ περισσεύσαι εἰς πάντας of the text preceding 1 Thess. iv. 9 in the homily. Notice also ἡμεῖς οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἀγαπησώμεν (ὁμοπίστους ἡμῶν), and compare the "O fratres nostri dilecti" of our Epistle.

It will be observed that Antiochus makes a mistake, and attributes Jude 21 to S. Peter. This verse forms one sentence with ver. 20 ὑμεῖς δέ, ἀγαπητοί, τῇ ἁγιωτάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτούς, ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσευχόμενοι. Cf. our writer's "O fratres nostri *dilecti.* Etiam, quod quis *ædificare* debeat et confirmare fratres *in fide,*" etc.

[1] A mistake for Jude 21.

It will be seen from the note to the beginning of *Hom.* 96 that Antiochus seems to borrow the language, ideas, and use of Jude 21 from Polycarp. Compare the words last quoted from our Epistle. Antiochus seems to have the confusion between SS. Peter and Jude fixed in his mind. In *Hom.* 1 (*de Fide*), after naming S. Peter and misquoting 2 Pet. i. 5, he says καὶ αὖθις, "'Εποικοδομοῦντες ἐν τῇ πίστει, νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε," and the rest of 1 Pet. v. 8 and part of ver. 9. If our readers will turn back to p. 44 sq., they will see that our writer in § 2 uses *Hom.* 1 and also a quotation from the beginning of *Hom.* 98, which is here again used in the passage now in hand. There is nothing, it must be noticed, in Antiochus' language here answering to our writer's "in fide unius Dei." In § 2, in the parallel place, is "fide in Deo," taken, as was there shown, from *Hom.* 1. All this proves that our writer pieced together his work out of the *Homilies* of Antiochus, and confirms the conjecture that in the passage now before us he used Jude 21 (*vid. sup.* p. 62, Dr. Westcott's remarks).

As our writer proceeds the redundancy of language mentioned above is continued and even increased. After three or four lines there will be found a piece of what Dr. Westcott calls "mosaic," which curiously confirms the line we have been taking. Our writer says still in *Ep.* i. 13:—

Quod *messis multa sit, operarii autem pauci*, etiam hoc notum est atque manifestum. Itaque *precemur Dominum messis, ut emittat operarios in messem suam*, operarios tales, qui *recte tractent verbum veritatis, operarios inconfusibiles*, operarios fideles; operarios, qui *sint lux mundi*, operarios, qui *operentur non hunc cibum, qui perituris sit, verum cibum illum, qui permaneat in vitam æternam;* operarios tales, quales apostoli; operarios qui imitentur patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum, de hominum salute sollicitos; non operarios, (nine times more).

Ὅτι δέ, "ὁ θερισμὸς πολύς, καὶ οἱ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι," δῆλον ὅτι ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς ἡμῶν λιμός[1] ἐστιν τοῦ ἀκοῦσαι λόγον κυρίου. διὸ δεηθῶμεν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ, ὅπως ἐκβάλλῃ ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ· ἀλλ' ἐργάτας τοιούτους, ὀρθοτομοῦντας τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀνεπαισχύντους, ἀνεπιλήπτους, ἐργάτας πιστούς, φωστῆρας οἰκουμένης, ἐργαζομένους μὴ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην, ἀλλὰ τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον· ἐργάτας τοιούτους, ὡς οἱ ἀπόστολοι, καὶ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς, οἷς ἔλεγεν ὁ Παῦλος· "Οὐ τὸ ἔργον μου ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν κυρίῳ;" Συνεργοὺς τῷ[2] κυρίῳ εἰς τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, ἐργαζομένους τὴν σωτηρίαν τῶν

[1] Cf. Amos viii. 11.

[2] The teaching of Antiochus all along is founded on that of Dionysius the

ἀνθρώπων· "Οὐ γὰρ θέλει ὁ Θεὸς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, ὡς τὸ ἐπιστρέψαι, καὶ ζῆν αὐτόν." · · · "Ἔστιν[1] γὰρ τῆς ἱεραρχίας ἡ τελείωσις, τὸ κατ' οἰκείαν ἀναλογίαν ἐπὶ τὸ θεομίμητον ἀναχθῆναι, καὶ Θεοῦ συνεργὸν γενέσθαι, καὶ δεῖξαι τὴν θείαν ἐνέργειαν κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ φαινομένην, καὶ φωτίζεσθαι, καὶ φωτίζειν, καὶ καθαίρεσθαι καὶ καθαίρειν, καὶ τελεῖσθαι τὰ θεῖα, καὶ τελεσιουργεῖν."—*Hom.* 122.

Antiochus' δῆλον transformed into "notum atque manifestum" will be observed, and his use of Amos viii. 11 in the same sentence should be compared with the eagerness with which our writer sends his "operarios" into the harvest. Our readers will be struck, as not a few other readers have been, by the words of our Epistle "operarios qui imitentur patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum de hominum salute sollicitos." The language of the *homily* is different. Antiochus encourages to the work by quoting Ezek. iii. 17–19. Work with the Lord, he argues, and ye shall not labour in vain, for God willeth not the death of the sinner. Our writer transforms this idea into an imitation (obs. θεομίμητον of Dionys.) of God in Three Persons in this work of salvation. And the words quoted above from nearly the end of the homily explain the reason. The mind of Antiochus had already anticipated, as we may see from his language (see note below), what he purposed to write. It is his custom to do so, to add the quotations at the close which support the sentiments of the discourse. And thus it is with this *Hom.* 122. The longer passage quoted above is from the beginning and the shorter from the end, where it is found as part of an accurate quotation from Dion. Areop. *Cœl. Hier.* iii. 2. Our writer carries the use of Dionysius a step farther than Antiochus does, when he speaks of imitating the Three Persons in the blessed Trinity. The fraud therefore, as our writer would say, is "notum atque manifestum."

Areopagite as expounded by Maximus, *Schol. in Lib.* III. *de Cœl. Hier.* p. 13: "Κεκληρωμένων ἡ τελείωσις." Σημείωσαι τίς ἡ τῶν ἱεραρχῶν τελείωσις, καὶ πῶς Θεοῦ εἰσι συνεργοὶ κατὰ τὸν θεῖον Ἀπόστολον. "Τὴν θείαν ἐνέργειαν." Τουτέστι τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔργα καὶ αὐτὸν ἐργαζόμενον, σοφίζοντα, τελειοῦντα, καὶ τὰ ὅμοια, εἰς τοὺς παιδαγωγουμένους κατὰ δύναμιν ἐργαζόμενον. "Ἐπειδὴ τάξις." · Σημείωσαι τὴν τάξιν καὶ τὸ τῆς ἱεραρχίας ἀποτέλεσμα, καὶ ὅτι τοὺς προσιόντας δεῖ πρῶτον καθαίρεσθαι τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῶν διαιρετικῶν τῆς ἁμαρτίας συμφύρσεων· εἶτα φωτίζεσθαι τῇ γνώσει τῶν θεοπνεύστων Γραφῶν τὰ περὶ θεογνωσίας δόγματα κ.τ.λ.

[1] Part of an accurate quotation from Dion. Areop. *Cœl. Hier.* iii. 2. This quotation is used by our writer again along with the words of Antiochus which stand on either side of it in *Ep.* i. 9. *Vid. inf.* p. 77 sq.

We shall now be quite safe in concluding that while Dr. Westcott is perfectly right in supposing that the coincidence in language between the Epistle and Hegesippus (or rather Eusebius) has great significance, he has nevertheless fallen into the trap which was carefully set by the writer of our Epistles. And no doubt this writer would feel himself amply rewarded if he could only peruse Dr. Westcott's remarks. We imagine, however, that he would feel some of the surprise which the rustic trap-setter feels when he finds that he has secured his victim, not fairly by the leg, but in some unexpected fashion. The writer beyond a doubt intended that his reader should infer that Hegesippus had derived the formula "the Law and the Prophets and the Lord" from the veritable Clement. Dr. Westcott escaped the trap so far. But then instead of drawing the inference that our writer had got the formula from Eusebius, he must needs go into the trap and conclude that he had found a genuine stamp of antiquity. This is a monumental illustration of the caution which is necessary in dealing with striking coincidences when they are found to exist between the scraps of ancient authors preserved by Eusebius and writings the date of which are in doubt, or at least have never been investigated. This instance may be added to the other which has been already pointed out (*vid. sup.* p. 10 sq.).

§ 5.

On the passage quoted above from *Ep.* i. 13, Cardinal Villecourt has a note the tenor of which may be sufficiently gathered from the following remarks:—

> Their (Epistles to Virgins) editor, Cardinal Clement Villecourt, maintaining them to be the genuine work of his patron saint, argued that the clergy are all included in the class addressed, because they are exhorted to duties that may be regarded as clerical. But more probably the inference is the other way. Virgins (of either sex) were so honoured in the Church that they were admitted to teach and judge in it, though not ordained. We know that martyrs came to hold such a position, and that their claims came into unpleasant conflict with the disciplinary jurisdiction of the clergy; and we have a hint, as early as St. Ignatius (*ad Polyc.* 5, already quoted), that the same was the case with the claims of virgins.—Simcox, *Beginnings of the Christian Church*, p. 389 (Rivingtons, 1881).

If this writer had examined the Epistles to Virgins before using them, he would have been saved from citing a document not earlier than the seventh century in illustration of the times of Melito. Perhaps he has examined the Ignatian Letters with as little care as these Epistles. At any rate a portion of Ignat. *ad Polyc.* 5 is quoted by Antiochus in *Hom.* 21, and a little below it will be found the original of a passage which Mr. Simcox no doubt has read with interest in *Ep.* ii. 2. Cardinal Villecourt laid hold on it as a mark of primitive times, and Dr. Lightfoot and Dr. Westcott no doubt find a place for it in their picture of the church life of the second century.

Post hæc preces fundimus et nobis damus osculum pacis, viri viris. Mulieres autem et virgines manus suas vestimentis suis involvere debent; atque ibi etiam nos modeste et in omni verecundia, oculis in altum sublatis, verecunde et cum omni decentia dexteram manum vestimentis nostris involvimus; et tunc accedere possunt et dare nobis osculum pacis in dexteram nostram vestimentis nostris involutam. Post quæ imus illuc, quo Deus nobis ire concessit.—*Ep.* ii. 2.

Χρὴ οὖν πάσῃ φυλακῇ τηρεῖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ καρδίαν, καὶ μηδ' ὅλως συνδυάζειν παρθένον μετὰ νεανίσκου τὸ παράπαν· εἰ δὲ καὶ εὔρεθῶσιν πρεσβύτιδες ἱεροπρεπεῖς, εἰλῆσαι τὰς ἑαυτῶν χεῖρας τῷ ἑαυτῶν ἱματίῳ. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες μετὰ αἰδοῦς ὀρθῶς βλέποντες σωφρόνως τε καὶ σεμνῶς ἐν κυρίῳ, τὰς ἑαυτῶν δεξίας[1] περικεκαλυμμένας ἔχοντες τῷ ἑαυτῶν ἱματίῳ, ἀποχωρισθῶσιν.—*Hom.* 21.

The foundation of these two passages is the same. Our writer has industriously woven in the kiss of peace and whatever else is appropriate thereto. The way in which he handles ὀρθῶς βλέποντες is delightful. The history of the passage as it stands in Antiochus is sufficiently explained above (p. 50 sq.). Cardinal Villecourt points out that this custom of kissing hands here shown to be so ancient has come down to our own times. Only, he says, the covering of the hands with the garment was discontinued when gloves came into use. Not a few antiquarian guesses rest upon as substantial premises as this.

§ 6.

Before remembrance is quite lost of the passage from Dionysius quoted above by Antiochus, it may be as well to point out that the same passage is used by our writer in *Ep.* i. 9.

[1] Cf. pseudo-Athan. *de Virgin.* 11 Χειρίδια ἐριᾶ περικαλύπτοντα τοὺς βραχίονας ἕως τῶν δακτύλων τῶν χειρῶν.

Ep. i. 8 is one of the most remarkable in the First Epistle. It is founded on Gal. v. 21 ("*Now the works of the flesh*," etc.), but in it the apostle's list is swelled out to an extraordinary length. Cardinal Villecourt says "Primo intuitu exuberantior videbitur ista tot (some sixty) vitiorum enumeratio, præsertim cum sermo dirigatur ad eos qui, viam perfectionis ingressi, supponi facile nequeunt his facinoribus inquinandi." The Cardinal's first thoughts are no doubt correct. The whole passage is found in *Hom.* 130, the subject of which is "The Kingdom of Heaven." The list, though "exuberantior," comes in naturally enough, for "they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Scholars will no doubt be gratified to be able to correct their translations of the Syriac by the original Greek. Cardinal Villecourt does not, however, stick to his first thoughts. He remembers that Clement was bishop of Rome. Does not S. Paul (Rom. i. 26, 27) give a terrible description of the condition of society? "Indirecte sanctus pontifex" strikes at this state of things. It is all quite plain and satisfactory. It is not often that one is permitted to see the process by which the critic succeeds in blinding his own eyes. First thoughts, if one could only have them, upon selected passages from some ecclesiastical documents would make an interesting study. What could be more interesting, for example, than the first thoughts of critics on finding the story of the Phœnix in Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians? We know what their second thoughts are, but they are not so valuable.

The insertion here of the long passage common to *Ep.* i. 8 and *Hom.* 130 will not answer any useful purpose. We therefore take up the two documents just before it concludes.

Hanc ob causam merito dicit in generationem istiusmodi: *Non habitabit spiritus meus in hominibus in perpetuum, quia caro sunt.* Omnis ergo, in quo spiritus *Christi* non est, *is* non est ejus, sicut scriptum est: *Recessit Spiritus Dei a Saul, et vexavit eum spiritus nequam, qui super eum emissus fuerat a Deo.*

IX. Voluntati Spiritus Dei consentit quisquis, in quo est

"Οὐ μὴ γὰρ καταμείνῃ, φησίν, τὸ Πνεῦμά μου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σάρκας." "Εἴ τις τοίνυν Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ." Ὁ γὰρ Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἔχων, Πνεύματι Θεοῦ στοιχεῖ, καὶ Πνεύματι Θεοῦ τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῖ, καὶ ζῇ τῷ Θεῷ ὑποπιάζων καὶ δουλαγωγῶν τὴν σάρκα, ἵνα ἐνοικήσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα τὸ εἰρηνικόν. Καὶ

Spiritus Dei; et quia consentit Spiritui Dei, ideo carnis opera mortificat vivitque Deo, subigens et *in servitutem redigens corpus suum affligensque illud, ut aliis prædicans pulcrum sit exemplum* et imago fidelibus ac versetur in operibus Spiritu sancto dignis, ut ne *reprobus fiat*, sed probatus sit coram Deo et coram hominibus.

φρουρούμενος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ποιήσει καρπὸν πίστεως, ἀρετῆς, σοφίας, ἁγνείας κ.τ.λ.—*Hom.* 130.

Ab eo, inquam, *homine, qui Dei est, desiderium carnis* omne abest, inprimis autem ab utriusque sexus virginibus; sed fructus eorum omnes sunt *fructus spiritus* et vitæ, ac veraciter sunt civitas Dei et habitacula et *templa*, in quibus commoratur et *habitat Deus* versaturque sicut in sancta civitate cælesti. Ideo autem *mundo apparetis sicut luminaria, quia ad verbum vitæ attenditis;* atque ita estis revera laus et gloria ac lætitiæ corona et gaudium bonorum servorum in Domino nostro Jesu Christo. Omnes enim, qui videbunt nos, *agnoscent vos esse semen, cui benedixit Dominus*, esse veraciter semen inclitum sanctumque et *regnum sacerdotale, gentem sanctam, gentem hereditatis*, heredes divinarum promissionum, quæ nec corrumpuntur nec marcescunt: *id quod oculus non vidit nec auris audivit nec in cor hominis adscendit, quod Deus præparavit diligentibus illum et mandata ejus observantibus.*

Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκ ἔστιν φρόνημα σαρκικόν. Ἀλλὰ πάντες οἱ καρποὶ τοῦ πνεύματος, οἱ σωτήριοι, ἐν οἷς οἰκεῖ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἐμπεριπατεῖ. Ἐν οἷς φαίνονται ὡς φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ, λόγον ζωῆς ἔχοντες ὡς ἀληθῶς, καὶ καύχημα, καὶ δόξα τῆς εὐσεβείας ὑπάρχοντες. "Ἡ γὰρ ἱεραρχία . . . καὶ τελεσιουργεῖν," ἵνα πᾶς ὁ ὁρῶν ὑμᾶς, ἐπιγνώσηται ὅτι σπέρμα εὐλογημένον ἐστὲ ὑπὸ κυρίου, ἀληθῶς σπέρμα ἔντιμον, "Βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν Θεοῦ," κληρονόμοι ἀφθάρτων καὶ ἀμαράντων ἐπαγγελιῶν, "Ὧν ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ ἴδεν, καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν," καὶ φυλάττουσιν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ.—*Hom.* 122.

The writer of the Epistle here in many ways betrays that he is the copyist. Thus the text concerning Saul is an addition. Why Antiochus should omit it is not evident, but how our writer comes to add it is quite clear. The passage quoted from *Hom.* 122 is near the end, and near the beginning of *Hom.* 123 will be seen the words *τί δὲ ὁ Σαοὺλ θύων*; and it was the ill-advised sacrifice of Saul that led to the withdrawal of God's Spirit. The words, however, are not the words of Antiochus, but of Dionysius the Areopagite, from whose *Ep.* 8 a long passage is quoted.

There is, again, nothing in the language of Antiochus resembling the "pulcrum exemplum et imago fidelibus" of our writer. There is no reason why Antiochus should omit these words. On the contrary, since *Hom.* 122 is upon the

duties of the priesthood, and contains such texts as *τύποι γενόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου*, 1 Pet. v. 3, while it is easy to see how the words have come into our Epistle, it is evident that Antiochus would not have omitted them.

There is, again, nothing in the Greek of Antiochus answering to "sicut in sancta civitate cœlesti," or the "civitas Dei;" but it is quite evident that the language is exceedingly appropriate to the passage from Dion. Areop. *Cœl. Hier.* iii. 2, which occupies the exactly parallel place in the page of the homily. The transparent use of it here confirms the conclusion that the same passage was used on the former occasion (*vid. sup.* p. 73).

§ 7.

It is time now to take another of those pictures of early church life which have seemed in the eyes of critics infallible proofs of very high, if not the very highest antiquity. The passage quoted will be a long one, and for greater convenience will be divided into two parts.

Ep. i. 11.

Ne multi inter vos sint doctores, fratres, neque omnes sitis prophetæ. Qui in verbis suis non prævaricatur, hic homo perfectus est, potens domare et subigere totum corpus suum. (ten texts follow which are not in *Hom.* 22).

Hom. 22.

Ὁ δὲ Ἰάκωβος· "Εἴ τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ πταίει, οὗτος τέλειος ἀνὴρ δυνατὸς χαλιναγωγῆσαι καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα." . . . καὶ πάλιν· "Μὴ πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί μου, εἰδότες ὅτι τὸ μεῖζον κρῖμα ληψόμεθα" (four texts follow which are not in *Ep.* i. 11).

"Ἀμεινον οὖν (om.[1]) ἐστιν σιωπᾶν καὶ εἶναι, ἢ λαλοῦντας (λαλοῦντα) μὴ εἶναι. καλὸν τὸ διδάσκειν, ἐὰν ὁ λέγων ποίῃ. εἷς οὖν ὁ (om.) διδάσκαλος· ὡς (ὃς) εἶπεν, καὶ ἐγένετο· καὶ ἃ σιγῶν δὲ πεποίηκεν, ἄξια τοῦ Πατρός ἐστιν. Ὁ λόγον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (om.) κεκτημένος ἀληθῶς δύναται καὶ τῆς ἡσυχίας αὐτοῦ ἀκούειν, ἵνα ᾖ τέλειος, ἵνα διʼ ὧν λαλεῖ πράσσῃ, καὶ διʼ ὧν σιγᾷ γινώσκηται. Οὐδὲν γὰρ (om.) λανθάνει τὸν κύριον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἡμῶν ἐγγὺς αὐτοῦ (αὐτῷ) εἰσιν (ἐστίν)."

Timeamus ergo judicium, quod imminet doctoribus. Grave enimvero judicium subituri sunt doctores illi, qui *docent et non faciunt;* et illi, qui Christi nomen mendaciter assumunt dicuntque se docere veritatem, at *circumcursant et* temere *vagantur* seque exaltant

Φοβηθῶμεν οὖν τὸ κρῖμα τῶν διδασκάλων. περισσότερον γάρ ἐστι τῶν λεγόντων, καὶ μὴ ποιούντων, τὸ κρῖμα· ψευδώνυμον γνῶσιν διδασκόντων, καὶ ἐμβατευόντων εἰκῇ καὶ φυσιουμένων ἀπὸ τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκός, τυφλῶν τυφλοὺς ὁδηγούντων, καὶ ἀμφοτέρων εἰς βόθυ-

[1] Ignat. *Ephes.* 15. The words in brackets show Zahn's readings.

atque *gloriantur in sententia car-* νον πιπτόντων. ἐκ γὰρ ἐξόδου
nis suæ. Isti sunt sicut, *cæcus,* λόγου αὐτῷ γνωσθήσεται ἀνήρ.
qui cæco ducatum præstat et in foveam cadunt ambo. At condem-
nabuntur, propterea quod garrulitate sua, etc.

This passage has been given, partly because it shows the substantial accuracy with which Antiochus quotes Ignatius, and which no less marks his quotations from Dionysius the Areopagite, and partly because it was necessary for the study of the passage which is to follow to show the provision which our writer made beforehand for the use of "prophetis" which is found in it, but which has nothing answering to it in the parallel passage from Antiochus. Now it happens that in making this provision by writing "Ne multi inter vos sint doctores, fratres, neque omnes sitis prophetæ" (joining parts of Jas. iii. 1 and 1 Cor. xii. 29 together), our writer thoughtlessly cut off from Jas. iii. 1 the latter part, "*Knowing that we shall receive the greater condemnation,*" which is the peg on which his own argument in the passage before us ought to hang. Thus his words "Timeamus ergo judicium, quod imminet doctoribus," look back to that part of Jas. iii. 1 which our writer has struck out. In Antiochus, on the contrary, all is plain. *His* τὸ κρῖμα τῶν διδασκάλων looks back to the Jas. iii. 1 quoted by him in its entirety. *His* τῶν λεγόντων καὶ μὴ ποιούντων no less refer to Ignatius' ἐὰν ὁ λέγων ποίῃ, while his ἐκ γὰρ ἐξόδου λόγου αὐτῷ γνωσθήσεται ἀνήρ as plainly takes up Ignatius' καὶ δι' ὧν σιγᾷ γινώσκηται. These last words of Antiochus appear to be also a glance at S. Matt. xii. 33 ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ καρποῦ τὸ δένδρον γινώσκεται, and ver. 37 ἐκ γὰρ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιωθήσῃ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου καταδικασθήσῃ. This our writer sees, for at the exact spot where there should be words answering to those of Antiochus we find "at condemnabuntur propterea quod garrulitate," etc. But this reference Antiochus would naturally make, for the γινώσκηται and indeed the underlying thought of Ignat. *Ephes.* § 15 come from S. Matt. xii. 33 sq. For the close of § 14 stands thus:—

Οὐδεὶς πίστιν ἐπαγγελλόμενος ἁμαρτάνει, οὐδὲ ἀγάπην κεκτημένος μισεῖ. "Φανερὸν τὸ δένδρον ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτοῦ·" οὕτως οἱ ἐπαγγελλόμενοι Χριστοῦ εἶναι, δι' ὧν πράσσουσιν ὀφθήσονται. οὐ γὰρ νῦν ἐπαγγελίας τὸ ἔργον, ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει πίστεως ἐάν τις εὑρέθῃ καὶ εἰς τέλος.

Compare 1 Tim. vi. 20, 21 *καὶ ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως· ἣν τινὲς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἠστόχησαν.* The language of Ignatius would seem to have recalled this text to the mind of Antiochus, and hence his "Knowledge falsely so called." But observe our writer's "et illi, qui Christi nomen mendaciter assumunt," and compare Ignatius' *οἱ ἐπαγγελλόμενοι Χριστοῦ εἶναι.* The passage just quoted from Ignatius § 14, with the exception of the last clause, is accurately quoted by Antiochus in *Hom.* 57. From which it is plain that the passage is one which he had considered. All these things plainly prove our writer to have been the copyist.

The conclusion of *Ep.* i. 11 may be fitly prefaced by the following note by Cardinal Villecourt:—

> Cuicunque homini rem ac verba serio perpendenti meditantique, locus iste sufficeret ad probandam hujus Epistolæ authenticitatem; evidens est enim mentionem hic fieri de donis et revelationibus quæ communia erant temporibus apostolicis, et de quibus disserit sanctus Paulus (1 Cor. xiv.). Quis falsarius de talibus fictionem struere unquam cogitasset? Detur vero reperiri potuisse impostorem qui hujusmodi charismatum fraudulentam existentiam finxisset: sermonem tunc non raptim absolvisset, sed late tractasset. Igitur et materia et brevitas, et candor virum apostolicum demonstrant. Et quid dicam de auctoritate loquentis? Quis enim ausus fuisset ita fidelium et perfectorum mores dirigere, nisi vir apostolicus, imo pontifex?—P. 407, note 13 (Migne).

It is the old story repeated over and over again among men, and not least in these times. A guileless soul fancies that it knows every turn and winding of the mind of an impostor, and therefore concludes that the guile which it cannot itself imagine must be equally unimaginable to a rogue. A writing cannot be a fraud, say the critics of to-day, if the reason for it is not self-evident to us, and if the like to it cannot be at once produced. If they were logical they would say that there are no literary frauds in the world at all, for if a first fraud is an impossibility, there can hardly be a second or a third. The critics upon the Epistles to Virgins who smile at the simplicity of the good Cardinal, nevertheless, by an exactly similar process of reasoning, put aside the idea that the Epistles can possibly have been written after the times of Epiphanius and Jerome.

Ep. i. 11.

At condemnabuntur, propterea quod garrulitate sua et vana doctrina *animalem* docent *sapientiam* atque *inanem fallaciam* verborum persuasionis *sapientiæ humanæ, secundum voluntatem principis potestatis aëris et spiritus illius, qui vim suam exserit in immorigeris; secundum institutionem hujus sæculi et non secundum doctrinam Christi.* Verumtamen si accepisti *sermonem scientiæ* aut *sermonem doctrinæ aut prophetiæ aut ministerii*, laudetur *Deus, qui largiter opitulatur omnibus, qui omnibus dat nec opprobrat.* Illo igitur charismate, quod a Domino accepisti, illo inservi fratribus pneumaticis, prophetis, qui dignoscant Dei esse verba ea, quæ loqueris; et enarra quod accepisti charisma in ecclesiastico conventu ad ædificationem fratrum tuorum in Christo. Nam bona sunt et eximia ea, quæ utilitatem hominibus Dei afferunt, si apud te revera sunt. XII. Pulcrum quoque atque utile est *visitare pupillos et viduas*, inprimis pauperes, qui multos habent liberos, *ante omnia autem domesticos fidei.* Sunt hæc sine controversia officium servorum Dei, eaque præstare pulcrum ipsis atque decorum est. Porro etiam hoc convenit fratribus in Christo et justum atque decorum ipsis est, ut visitent eos, qui a malis spiritibus vexantur.

πλήν, εἰ εἴληφας χάρισμα πνευματικόν, καὶ λόγον σοφίας, ἢ γνώσεως, ἢ διδασκαλίας, ἢ προφητείας, ἢ διακονίας, εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς ὁ πάμπλουτος, "ὁ Θεός, ὁ διδοὺς πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, καὶ μὴ ὀνειδίζων." Σὺ οὖν—τοὺς τοιούτους. Χάρισμα ἔχεις παρὰ κυρίου, διακόνησον τοῖς πνευματικοῖς, τοῖς γινώσκουσιν, ὅτι ἃ λέγεις, κυρίου ἐστίν, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ἀδελφότητος, ἐν πάσῃ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ πραότητι· ὅπερ ἐστὶ καλὸν καὶ ὠφέλιμον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.—*Hom.* 47.

ὅτι δὲ καλὸν τὸ ἐπισκέπτεσθαι ὀρφανοὺς καὶ χήρας ἐν τῇ θλίψει αὐτῶν, καὶ πολυτέκνους πένητας, μάλιστα δὲ πρῶτον καὶ τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως, πᾶσιν πρόδηλα καὶ ἀναντίρρητά ἐστιν· Ὅτι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο καλὸν καὶ ὠφέλιμον τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀδελφότητι τοὺς δαιμονιῶντας ἐπισκέπτεσθαι.—*Hom.* 99.

On the first part of this passage Funk says "In unum conflata sunt Col. ii. 8, 4 et Eph. ii. 2." After "pneumaticis" will be seen the word "prophetis," which has no place in Antiochus, and naturally, for while he could speak of the gift προφητείας, he could hardly speak of the prophets. This is the class of persons which, as has been shown above (p. 79), our writer coupled with the "doctores." He evidently thought that the mention of the prophets as a recognised class would be consistent with the times of Clement. And in the same way he has touched into his picture of church life just those features which were proper, as he supposed, to the days of Clement, and which seemed so conclusive to Cardinal

Villecourt. Our writer has done exactly the same throughout § 12 which lies in brief in *Hom.* 99.

Some words, it will be observed, are omitted from the passage quoted above out of *Hom.* 47. They deserve special attention. The passage when filled in runs—

ὁ Θεὸς ὁ πάμπλουτος, "ὁ Θεὸς ὁ διδοὺς πᾶσιν ἁπλῶς καὶ μὴ ὀνειδίζων." Σὺ οὖν μὴ ἐπαίρου κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον, ἐπεὶ οὐ παραμένει σοι ἡ χάρις· οὐ βδελύττεται γὰρ τοὺς τοιούτους.

Antiochus here drops ἁπλῶς out of Jas. i. 5, and taking it in the sense of *affluenter* (a fact possibly to be borne in mind) writes πάμπλουτος, a very rare word, outside the text. Our writer quotes the text as Antiochus does—*qui omnibus dat nec opprobrat*—and in the place of πάμπλουτος has *qui largiter opitulatur omnibus.* Our writer's action is plain enough. How is Antiochus' to be explained? Ecclus. xi. and a fragment attributed to Sophocles explain the mystery. Ecclus. xi. has—

μὴ αἰνέσεις ἄνδρα ἐν κάλλει αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ βδελύξῃ (obs.) ἄνθρωπον ἐν ὁράσει αὐτοῦ, ver. 2; ἐν περιβολῇ ἱματίων μὴ καυχήσῃ, καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ δόξης μὴ ἐπαίρου (obs.), ver. 4; ἀγαθὰ καὶ κακά, ζωὴ καὶ θάνατος, πτωχεία καὶ πλοῦτος παρὰ κυρίου ἐστί. Δόσις (obs.) κυρίου[1] παραμένει (obs.) εὐσεβέσι, ver. 17; ὅτι κοῦφον ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς κυρίου διὰ τάχους ἐξάπινα πλουτίσαι πένητα, ver. 21; πρὸ τελευτῆς μὴ μακάριζε μηδένα κ.τ.λ., ver. 28.

The last is the oft-quoted saying known to everybody. With this and the language of Antiochus compare the following:—

3. Σοφοκλέους Τυνδάρεως.

Οὐ χρή ποτ' εὖ πράσσοντος ὀλβίσαι τύχας
ἀνδρός, πρὶν αὐτῷ παντελῶς ἤδη βίος
διεκπερανθῇ καὶ τελευτήσῃ βίον.
ἐν γὰρ βραχεῖ καθεῖλε κὠλίγῳ χρόνῳ
πάμπλουτον ὄλβον δαίμονος κακοῦ δόσις,
ὅταν μεταστῇ, καὶ θεοῖς δοκῇ τάδε.

4. Ἀλέξιδος ἐκ Βρεττίας.

Τοιοῦτο τὸ ζῆν ἐστιν ὥσπερ οἱ κύβοι·
οὐ ταύτ' ἀεὶ πίπτουσιν, οὐδὲ τῷ βίῳ
ταυτὸν διαμένει σχῆμα, μεταβολὰς δ' ἔχει.

Stob. *Flor. Serm.* cv. 3, 4.

Antiochus uses the language of Ecclesiasticus, which, never-

[1] This part of the verse (17) and the following verse (21) are transposed and quoted together, sometimes as if one text, by the commonplace writers, *e.g.* Max. *Serm.* 51; Anton. Mel. I. *Serm.* 44, p. 83.

theless, he contradicts, and he contradicts because his mind is recalled by the πρὸ τελευτῆς κ.τ.λ. of Ecclesiasticus to Stobæus, where the saying is quoted again and again by different writers, and where only the fragment of Sophocles is found which supplies him with πάμπλουτος. As Antiochus writes he glances at the fragment which stands next in Stobæus, using, however, the language of Ecclesiasticus. This is a coincidence like to those pointed out above between *Hom.* 21 and the *Sermo* of Antonius Melissa. It seems to us to suggest that some later hand has touched up the *Homilies* of Antiochus.

The facts here pointed out have a special interest in our eyes, for the *Sermo* of Stobæus here used by Antiochus (or whoever writes in his name) is the very one on which the piece of Greek referred to on p. 52 is founded. In that the very passages just quoted are glanced at in the words πρὸς ὀλίγον ἡ χάρις (obs.), φέρων μεταβολάς, οὐ πίπτουσαν, while beneath it the writer quotes "Let not the wise man boast in his wisdom," etc. (Jer. ix. 23), which is just as appropriate to the line taken by Antiochus as to that followed by himself. After this he seems to use one of the verses cited above from Ecclus. xi. Writers of this class either could not help, or took a pleasure in, taking notable words and thoughts from parallel passages and blending them into one paragraph. They forgot that in so doing they were leaving behind them the means for their certain detection. If they acted unconsciously, they have left behind them traces of their path, which, like the "trail" across the great prairies, may be followed slowly indeed, but still with certainty. If they intentionally wrote as they did, then they acted like the backwoodsman who with a light heart scores the "blazes" on the trees as he goes, yet cannot make sure that it will be always a friendly eye that will follow on his track.

§ 8.

It will be necessary to return to *Ep.* i. 12 and to compare this section still further with *Hom.* 99, because some critics have argued from it the high antiquity of our Epistles.

"The high antiquity of these Epistles is in some degree

testified by the non-appearance of any endeavour to support the pretensions of the hierarchical party; and by the circumstances, that the ideas of the priesthood belonging to the Old Testament are not here introduced into the Christian Church, as is the case in similar writings of the kind; that neither the separation of the priesthood from the laity, nor the distinction of bishops and presbyters occurs here; and that the gift of healing the sick, and especially demoniacs, is considered as a free gift, and not as a gift belonging to one peculiar office. And yet this is no certain proof of the high antiquity of the Epistles; because even if it were of later origin, all this might be explained from the idiosyncrasy of certain regions of the East."—Rose's *Neander*, ii. 332 (quoted in Soame's *Mosheim*, 2nd revised edition, 1850, p. 96).

The writer here falls into the same mistake as our other critics. He makes not even the least allowance for the desire of the pseudo-Clement to give verisimilitude to his work.

Ep. i. 12.

Porro etiam hoc convenit fratribus in Christo et justum atque decorum ipsis est, ut visitent eos, qui a malis spiritibus vexantur, atque orent et adjurationes super eos faciant utiliter, precibus, quæ acceptæ sint coram Deo, non vero verbis splendidis multisque, compositis atque præparatis, ut hominibus appareant eloquentes ac felicis memoriæ. Sunt autem similes *tibiæ sonanti aut tympano tinnienti* garrulitatem eorum, et nihil juvant eos, super quos adjurationes faciunt, sed proferunt verba terribilia, quibus homines terrificant, non vero agunt ibi cum vera fide secundum doctrinam Domini, qui dixit: *Hoc genus non exit nisi in jejunio ac precibus* firmis et continuis atque intenta mente. Itaque sancte orent petantque a Deo cum alacritate omnique sobrietate et castitate, sine odio et sine malitia. Sic adeamus fratrem aut sororem ægrotantes, eosque invisamus eo modo, quo hoc fieri

Hom. 99.

ὅτι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο καλὸν καὶ ὠφέλιμον τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀδελφότητι τοὺς δαιμονιῶντας ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, καὶ εὔχεσθαι ἐπάνω αὐτῶν εὐχὴν τῷ Θεῷ ἀρέσκουσαν, πιστῶς, καὶ μὴ ἐκ συνθέσεως λόγων πολλῶν, ἢ μελέτας ἐξορκισμῶν πρὸς ἐπίδειξιν ἀνθρωπαρεσκείας, πρὸς τὸ φανῆναι εὐλάλους, ἢ μνήμονας ἡμᾶς, δίκην αὐλοῦ ἠχοῦντας πρὸς τοὺς ἐνεργουμένους, φλυαρίας καὶ βαττολογίας, καὶ οὐκ ἐν πίστει ἀληθείας, καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὁ κύριος· τοῦτο γάρ φησιν· "Τὸ γένος ἐν προσευχῇ ἐκτενεῖ, καὶ πίστει μετὰ νηστείας, ἐξέρχεται." Νηφόντως οὖν τὸν κάμνοντα ἐπισκεψώμεθα, ὡς ἐν πνεύματι ταπεινώσεως. Καλὸν οὖν τὸ συγκοπιᾷν τοῖς κάμνουσιν ἀδελφοῖς, ὡς εἴρηται, δι' ἀγρυπνιῶν, καὶ νηστειῶν, καὶ εὐχῶν ἀδιαλείπτων. Ἐρρέθη γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, "Δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλετε," μετὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἰάσεων· "Δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε."

decet: sine dolo et sine pecuniæ amore et sine tumultu et sine garrulitate et sine agendi ratione, quæ sit a pietate aliena et sine superbia, sed cum animo demisso et humili Christi. Itaque jejunio et oratione exorcizent illos, non vero verbis elegantibus sciteque compositis atque digestis, sed sicut homines, qui a Deo acceperunt charisma sanandi, *gratis accepistis, gratis date*, confidenter, ad laudem Dei. Jejuniis vestris et precationibus ac continuis vigiliis ceterisque bonis vestris operibus opera carnis mortificate per virtutem spiritus sancti. Qui sic agit, *templum is spiritus sancti Dei est;* hic dæmonia ejiciat, et adjuvabit illum Deus. Nam pulcrum est opitulari ægrotantibus. Præcepit Dominus: *Dæmonia ejicite*, aliasque multas sanationes facere jussit, et: *gratis accepistis, gratis date.*

It will be observed that our writer uses S. Matt. x. 8 "*Freely ye have received, freely give,*" twice. Beelen omitted the first use of this text because it seemed to him to be a gloss. He was no doubt right. Antiochus uses the text but once. Our writer may be at once convicted of being the copyist. It is interesting to observe how here as elsewhere he has manipulated the language of Antiochus so as to suit, as he supposed, the times of Clement. Thus "it was said by the Lord" is altered into "the Lord commanded," the simple mention of the other cures is changed into the command to perform many other cures, and the same stress is laid upon that as upon the injunction "*Freely ye have received, freely give,*" while the stress which Antiochus lays upon the text is gained by using the text earlier.

Antiochus' *συγκοπιᾷν* comes from Ignat. *Polyc.* 6, which he uses at the beginning of *Hom.* 92.

There is another circumstance which plainly points out our writer as the copyist. Antiochus' *δίκην αὐλοῦ ἠχοῦντας* suggest 1 Cor. xiii. 1 *γέγονα χαλκὸς ἠχῶν ἢ κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον*, and our writer uses that text. Antiochus, however, is not looking directly at that text, but at 1 Cor. xiv. 7 *ὅμως τὰ ἄψυχα φωνὴν διδόντα, εἴτε αὐλός κ.τ.λ.*, where the apostle's argument is not concerning the necessity of love as an accessory to all gifts, as in c. xiii., but as here in the homily, of the use of gifts for the edification of the Church. If Antiochus had had the words of our Epistle before him it is not to be supposed that he would have made so considerable an alteration. The two passages, however, when placed side by side speak for themselves.

The language of Antiochus has been amplified and altered to suit our writer's purposes.

§ 9.

There is one more picture of church life which cannot be passed by, for it deeply impressed Cardinal Villecourt, and no doubt greatly governed Dr. Lightfoot and others in ascribing our Epistles to the middle of the second century, no earlier and no later—unless indeed it be thought that these writings emanated from Syria, in which case it might be well for safety sake to relax the possible limit of date to the beginning of the third century. Our writer lays great stress upon the washing of the feet. That this custom prevailed in the Church for some time is well known. But our writer joins with this the anointing of the person. Unction connected with baptism and other religious rites and ceremonies is of course familiar to students of the Apostolic Constitutions for example. But the everyday anointing of the person coupled with the washing of the feet is a less familiar custom, and must be very primitive. Our writer is very precise upon this point. He speaks but once of the kiss of peace, but once of the careful covering of the hands, but of the washing and anointing he speaks four times :—"neque lavant pedes nostros mulieres neque ungunt nos," *Ep.* ii. 1 ; "ille (frater) pedes nobis lavat, ille unguento nos ungit, ii. 2 ; nec lavant nobis pedes mulieres neque ungunt nos, ii. 3 ; et lavant tibi pedes et ungunt te mulieres," ii. 15. An extra washing is thrown in in ii. 4 by the citation of 1 Tim. v. 10. The few words quoted sufficiently indicate the tenor of the thrice uttered counsels which concern not the washing and anointing only, but the eating and drinking and sleeping arrangements. It is difficult, indeed impossible, to suppose that the writer was quite serious while writing down these repetitions. The three passages are founded upon one which occurs in Antiochus, *Hom.* 18 (*περὶ τοῦ μὴ ἐνδελεχίζειν ψαλλούσαις γυναιξίν, vid. sup.* p. 43 sq.), as will appear from the following comparison :—

III. Quod si incidimus in aliquem locum, ubi nullus sit frater sacratus, sed omnes sint conjuncti, omnes, qui ibi sunt, fratrem ad eos venientem suscipere debent et ministrare illi curamque de

illo habere in omnibus, studiose, cum propensa voluntate. Igitur frater ille, ut oportet, ministrandus est ab illis, sicuti convenit; debet autem ille frater junctis, qui sunt in eo loco, dicere: Nos Deo sacri cum mulieribus neque manducamus neque bibimus, neque inserviunt nobis mulieres aut virgines, nec lavant nobis pedes mulieres neque ungunt nos, nec sternunt nobis mulieres, nec somnum capimus ibi, ubi dormiunt mulieres, ut irreprehensibiles simus in omnibus, ut nemo offendatur aut scandalizetur in nobis; et quando omnia hæc agimus, *nemini sumus offendiculo.* Sicut homines ergo, *qui cognoscimus timorem Domini, hominibus suademus, Deo autem manifesti sumus.*

Ὅλως γὰρ ἀναρμόδιόν ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀσκῆσαι βουλομένῳ, μετὰ γυναικὸς ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν, ἢ ὑπὸ γυναικὸς ὑπηρετεῖσθαι, ἢ προνοεῖν γυναικῶν, ἢ ὅλως μετ' αὐτῶν ἔχειν γνῶσιν. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κανονικαῖς ἀνάρμοστόν ἐστι συνδυάζειν μετὰ ἀνδρῶν, πρὸς τὸ μηδένα σκανδαλίζεσθαι δι' ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ὦμεν πᾶσιν ἀπρόσκοποι. "Εἰδότες γάρ, φησίν, τὸν φόβον τοῦ κυρίου, ἀνθρώπους πείθομεν, Θεῷ δὲ φανερούμεθα."—*Hom.* 18.

The two passages are plainly the same. It is interesting to see how the language of Antiochus is applied and the picture of primitive church life filled in. There can be no doubt as to which passage was first written. There is, moreover, a plain proof close by.

Antiochus immediately proceeds:—

Φοβηθῶμεν τοίνυν, ὡς εἴρηται, τοῦ σκανδαλίσαι τινάς, ἀκούοντες τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντος, ὅτι "συμφέρει, ἵνα λίθος μυλικὸς κρεμασθῇ περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ῥιφθῇ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων" (S. Matt. xviii. 6). Χρὴ οὖν ὡς "ἀπὸ προσώπου ὄφεως καὶ ἁμαρτίας μεγάλης φεύγειν" ἀπ' αὐτῶν, διὰ τὸ θανατηφόρον εἶναι τοῖς βουλομένοις ἀσκεῖν, οὐ μόνον τὴν αὐτῶν ὁμιλίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἐνθύμησιν. He then quotes Prov. xxxi. 3, and then Ecclus. ix. 4 μετὰ ψαλλούσης μὴ ἐνδελέχιζε κ.τ.λ.—*Hom.* 18.

Quod si incurramus aliquo, ubi inveniamus mulierem Christianam unam solam, nec quisquam alius ibi adsit nisi sola hæc, non subsistimus in eo loco neque precationes ibi peragimus neque Scripturas ibi legimus, sed *aufugimus inde veluti a conspectu serpentis aut sicut a conspectu peccati.* Non autem, quod Christianam hanc mulierem spernamus —absit a nobis, ut tali animo affecti simus erga fratres nostros in Christo—sed quia sola est, ideo timemus, etc.—*Ep.* ii. 5.

The sentence in italics is clearly intended to be Antiochus' version of Ecclus. xxi. 2 ὡς ἀπὸ προσώπου ὄφεως, φεῦγε ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας. But our writer has given emphasis to the departure from the original beyond the intention of Antiochus. The consideration displayed for the good Christian woman

evidently arises from S. Matt. xviii. 6 quoted, as we see, by Antiochus (from memory, and so confused with S. Luke xvii. 2) in connection with Ecclus. xxi. 2. Our writer desires not "to offend" or, as S. Matt. has it in ver. 10, "to *despise* one of these little ones."

Ep. ii. 13 is the counterpart of one of Antiochus' *Homilies*, in that it concludes, as almost every *Homily* does, with a block or string of texts connected together with "aut illius," "et rursus dixit," "et alibi," etc., and among them "et: Cum muliere, quæ pulchre canit, noli esse assiduus," that is to say, Ecclus. ix. 4, quoted above by Antiochus. Our writer quotes it in connection with the history of Susannah, to which it does not seem to have any very obvious application.

But though it is quite plain that our writer made use of Antiochus in working up his picture of primitive church life, it does not yet appear why he should be so zealous about the anointing. Of course the washing of the feet was a custom founded upon our Lord's action on the first Maundy Thursday. In like manner it is natural to connect the anointing here spoken of with that anointing which was done to our Lord Himself. But our writer makes this to be a matter of everyday hospitality. In the earlier sections of the Second Epistle he supposes himself to be wandering about the country, and reaching a place where there may be only women, or both men and women, leading celibate lives, or a place where all are married, and he prescribes what is to be done and said. In all these the anointing has its place. In § 2 he supposes himself to be overtaken by night, and to be urged by the brethren, "per *φιλαδελφίαν* et *φιλοξενίας* causa," to lodge with them. He supposes himself to remain and to direct that all things proper to hospitality—the providing the food, the washing the feet, the anointing the person, the making the bed—should be done by some brother. These things are intended to be all parts of *φιλαδελφία* and *φιλοξενία*. The use of these Greek words seems to indicate that the Epistles were originally written in Greek (*vid. sup.* p. 62). Perhaps the following words from the beginning of *Hom.* 98, which has already been shown to have been used by our writer, may cast some light upon the subject. Antiochus says:—

Ἡ φιλυπτωχία καὶ ἡ φιλοξενία δύο κλάδοι εἰσὶν τῆς πίστητος τῆς ἐλαίας, ἧς ὁ καρπὸς μυρίζει πάντας, ἐξ ἧς ἀλείφεται ὁ κυρίος τὴν κεφαλήν, καὶ τοὺς πόδας, καὶ ἀνταμείβεται τὸν ἀλείφοντα, βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν. Ὁ γὰρ οὕτω φιλόπτωχος ἀκούει τοῦ λέγοντος· "Ἐλεημοσύναι καὶ πίστις μὴ ἐκλειπέτωσάν σε· ἄφαψαι δὲ αὐτὰς ἐπὶ σῷ τραχήλῳ, καὶ εὑρήσεις χάριν." κ.τ.λ. (Prov. iii. 3, 4).

These two verses are quoted in *Ep.* i. 2 (*vid. sup.* p. 45 sq.). Our writer perhaps has taken οὕτω literally, and possibly coupled in his own mind φιλαλοιφή (or some similar coinage) along with φιλαδελφία and φιλοξενία. There is such a word, it will be remembered, as φιλαλειπτεῖν. "In vulgat. lex. exponitur, Delector pigmentis et unguine: et afferuntur hæc verba (quorum autorem non nominat Etymol.) οὐκ ἔστι πίστις ἀνδρὶ φιλαλειπτοῦντι." (Steph. *Thesaur.* i. p. 320.) Any one remembering these words and disposed to take οὕτω very strictly, might feel that there was a certain aptness (something even in the sound of the words) in the way in which Antiochus quotes the text Ἐλεημοσύναι καὶ πίστις μὴ ἐκλειπέτωσάν σε. The probability that our writer made use of the passage from *Hom.* 98, quoted above, is to some extent confirmed by the fact that in the last place (*Ep.* ii. 15) where anointing appears, he speaks of Mary. He there writes "Nonne mirabile est de Domino, quod Mariæ, feminæ piissimæ, non permiserit attingere pedes ejus? Tu autem habitas cum mulieribus, a mulieribus et ab adulescentulis ministraris, et dormis, ubi dormiunt illæ, et lavant tibi pedes et ungunt te mulieres." The one idea seems to recall the other, as would be natural with any one who had used Antiochus as we have suggested. On a review of the whole circumstances we are at least fully justified in saying οὐκ ἔστι πίστις ἀνδρὶ φιλαλειπτοῦντι.

§ 10.

The greater part of the two Epistles can be, and indeed has been already, found in Antiochus. The few blanks can for the most part be filled up out of Jerome. One quotation more may however be given, because it has a special feature of interest.

In *Hom.* 112 Antiochus has καὶ τῆς ἁγνείας τὸν πολύμοχθον καὶ πολύμισθον πλοῦτον. It seems impossible not

to suppose that Antiochus has in view Ignat. *ad Polyc.* 1 *ὅπου γὰρ πλείων*[1] *κόπος, πολὺ καὶ τὸ κέρδος.* Our writer's version of Antiochus is "virginitatis, quæ ut res est magni laboris, ita et magnum quoque habet mercedem" (*Ep.* i. 5). Our writer seems to have more nearly approached Ignatius. This is natural enough, for at the close of *Hom.* 111 (see below) the words of Ignatius are quoted, followed by a passage from the next section (*ad Polyc.* 2). This passage contains *ἔστω φρόνιμος ἐν πᾶσιν ὡς οἱ ὄφεις, καὶ ἀκέραιος ὡς αἱ περιστεραί.* When, therefore, farther on in this same *Hom.* 112 we come to a sentence in which Antiochus plainly quotes along with them a few words from Ignat. *Ephes.* 8, it is obvious to conclude that Antiochus had throughout Ignatius in view. But the words from *ad Polyc.* 2 are found in *Ep.* ii. 6.

Ep. ii. 6.

Si vero contingat ut eamus in locum, ubi non sint Christiani, et necessarium nobis sit ibidem per aliquot dies consistere, *sapientes simus sicut serpentes et simplices sicut columbæ;* et ne simus *quasi insipientes, sed ut sapientes* in omni disciplina pietatis, ut Deus per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum omni in re glorificetur per vitæ nostræ rationem castam sanctamque. *Sive manducamus . . . ad Dei gloriam faciamus. Omnes, qui vident nos, semen benedictum* sanctumque *nos esse* et *filios Dei vivi* . . . in exemplum scilicet tam eorum, qui crediderunt, quam et illorum, qui deinceps crediturі sunt. Ex Christi grege simus omnimoda justitia moribusque sanctissimis integerrimis, conver-

Hom. 112.

οἱ γὰρ σαρκικοὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ πράσσειν οὐ δύνανται, οὐδὲ οἱ πνευματικοὶ τὰ σαρκικά (*Ephes.* 8). *Χρὴ οὖν τὸν βουλόμενον τὴν ἀγγελικὴν ταύτην τοῦ μονήρους βίου ἀσκῆσαι πολιτείαν, κτήσασθαι τὴν φρόνησιν τοῦ ὄφεως, καὶ τὸ ἀκέραιον τῆς περιστερᾶς, ἵνα συνιῇ ἐν παντί, τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ εὐάρεστον, καὶ τέλειον· ἵνα δοξάσθῃ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν πᾶσιν, διὰ τῆς θεοσεβοῦς ἡμῶν τάξεως, καὶ εἰλικρινοῦς πολιτείας· ἵνα οἱ ὁρῶντες ἡμᾶς ἐπιγνῶσιν, ὅτι σπέρμα εὐλογημένον ἅγιόν ἐσμεν, υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος κ.τ.λ.*—*Hom.* 111. *οὕτω τοίνον καὶ ἡγούμενος τύπος γινέσθω τοῦ ποιμνίου ἐν πάσῃ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἀναστροφῇ ἁγίᾳ· ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως πολιτευόμενος, τηρῶν ὅσα ἐστὶν ἁγνά, ὅσα σεμνά, εἴ τις*

[1] There was possibly some ancient *γνώμη* setting forth the profit of labour, for like thoughts are found in very many writers. Cf. Pind. *N.* 7. 109 *εἰ πόνος ἦν, τὸ τερπνὸν πλέον πεδέρχεται.* The connection of the idea with virginity seems plainly due to Jerome (*Ep.* xxii. 38 [p. 123] *Grandis labor, sed grande præmium, esse quod Martyres, esse quod Apostoli, esse quod Christus est*), who probably got it from Wisd. iii. 14, 15 *Et spado . . . dabitur enim illi fidei donum electum, et sors in templo Dei acceptissima. Bonorum enim laborum gloriosus est fructus.*

santes in rectitudine et sanctitate, ut decet fideles, et sectantes ea, quæ laudibilia sunt et quæ pudica et sancta et quæ gloriosa et honorifica; et quæcumque usui sunt, hæc instituite.

ἀρετή, καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος, εἴ τις εὔφημος. ὠφελείας διόρθωσις γινέσθω παρ' αὐτοῦ, "ἐκδικεῖν . . . ὅπου γὰρ πλείων κόπος, πολὺ καὶ τὸ κέρδος. . . . ἔστω φρόνιμος ἐν πᾶσιν ὡς οἱ ὄφεις, καὶ ἀκέραιος ὡς αἱ περιστεραί. κ.τ.λ." (Ignat. *Polyc.* §§ 1, 2.)

The passages are the same, and it is quite evident that our writer has not here shown the wisdom of the serpent, for he has taken words which Antiochus got from Ignatius. The special point of interest is that the words of the Homily, *οἱ γὰρ σαρκικοὶ . . . τῆς περιστερᾶς*, have been again and again copied out by the Ignatian critics as a blending of *Ephes.* 8 with *ad Polyc.* 2, and in doing so they must have read and have copied the words of the Epistle. The same critics have freely expressed their opinions upon the Epistles.

§ 11.

We do not propose to carry the investigation into the history of the Epistles to Virgins any farther, and we shall finish our remarks upon them with the quotation of a few lines from *Peregrinus Proteus.* In 1879 we knew something about these Epistles. We knew that they were not the Epistles mentioned by Epiphanius and Jerome, and that consequently, with the exception of the extract found by Cureton, they were without external testimony. We knew them to be found only in the A.D. 1470 MS. We knew that in that MS. a quasi-canonical position was assigned to them (*vid. sup.* p. 3). We did not believe it to be possible that any really ancient documents could be in such a strange case—unknown to ecclesiastical writers, yet as well known as the Epistles to the Corinthians, if the A.D. 1470 MS. was to be believed. In 1879 we had not the considerable time to spare which we thought would be required for a satisfactory examination of the Epistles to Virgins, and therefore made no attempt in that direction. We nevertheless ventured on a remark or two not much unlike a prophecy.

Speaking of the period—the times of the revival of learning

—in which the literary fraud traced out in *Peregrinus Proteus* was perpetrated, we wrote thus:—

Another fact which concerns the period of which we are speaking must be noticed. In the year 1470 (not earlier, though possibly somewhat later) a Syriac MS. was written which claims quasi-canonical authority for two Epistles on Virginity, bearing the name of Clement, but which are not found in any other MS., and which are not mentioned in any ecclesiastical catalogue. These Epistles follow[1] in the MS. the Philoxenian version of the Epistle of S. Jude. The Syriac MS(S) which contains Clement's two Epistles to the Corinthians gives the Philoxenian version of the N. T., and places these Epistles after S. Jude. Both MSS. loudly proclaim the date to which they ought to be assigned—the one to the year 1170, the other to the year 1470. It is interesting to see the likemindedness of these two scribes, separated from one another as it seems by the exact term of 300 years, and to observe that the claim of canonical authority for the Epistles on Virginity, which, whether ancient or not, were certainly never written by Clement of Rome, was made (apparently for the first time) at the very period when a claim of the same nature was being made for the Epistles to the Corinthians, which we have found good reason to believe to be spurious. There may be nothing in the coincidence: it is at any rate worth noticing (p. 317).

In 1879 we argued from the Epistles to the Corinthians to the Epistles to Virgins: now knowing what we do about these last Epistles we may argue from them to the Epistles to the Corinthians. Once more, therefore, we say that the coincidence is worth noticing.

[1] Epiphanius (*Hær.* xxx. 15, p. 139) speaks of "encyclical letters," in which Clement "teaches virginity;" but as he says that these letters were "read in the holy churches," it is probable that he has in his mind those letters to which Eusebius and Jerome refer, of the contents of which we are ignorant if the Epistles to the Corinthians now in our hands are frauds. The language of Epiphanius may, however, be thought to give a reason for the position which the scribe of 1470 assigns to the Epistles on Virginity in his MS.—*Peregr. Prot.* p. 317, note 2.

CHAPTER III.

CONCLUSION.

THE task proposed at the outset has now been accomplished. It has been proved that critics have been mistaken as to the times to which the Epistles to Virgins belong. These Epistles have been confidently assigned by them to the first, second, or third centuries of the Church, but they have been proved to belong to far later times. Earlier than the seventh century they cannot be, though, of course, they may be much later. We may perhaps be asked why we do not carry the investigations farther. We reply, that this would suit neither our convenience nor our purpose. The conclusion that these Epistles belong to the seventh century at the earliest is a sound one, and cannot be upset. We prefer to leave the question in this condition. The Epistles to Virgins are absolutely without value. The quotations in them out of Holy Scripture can be best read in the sacred pages themselves. Besides these quotations there is not a sentence that is worth reading, or if there is, it can be found elsewhere. These Epistles are, moreover, as seventh century (or later) documents, perfectly harmless. They will not be quoted any more in illustration of the manners and customs of the primitive Church. They will not again be used to support the Canon of the New Testament. If a new edition of these Epistles should appear to be desirable, their latest editor will doubtless undertake the task as a labour of love.

We prefer, moreover, to leave the question as it stands, because we are very desirous to know what learned criticism will now do with the Epistles to Virgins. Hitherto for the discovery of their date it has relied upon internal evidence, or, in other words, the cheap and easy process of reading them over a few times. This process has not been eminently successful so far, and we are curious to know whether it will

be continued, and if so, whether it will succeed better in the future. The school of ecclesiastical critics, with which our quarrel lies, seems to know no other method of finding out when documents were written. Clement's Second Epistle to the Corinthians runs on all fours with the Epistles to Virgins. It is one of the many claimants to the authorship of Clement, no one, or, as our readers would say, but one of which can substantiate its claim. Its date and authorship are alike unknown. Its critics know no better way of determining these questions than that of reading it. Thus in the article on CLEMENS ROMANUS in Smith and Wace, *Dict. Chr. Biog.*, the writer says "Internal evidence, though adverse to the Clementine authorship, assigns to the work a date not later than the second century, and probably the first half of it" (p. 558). The writer follows Dr. Lightfoot, and the latter critic follows Harnack, who, "as the result of a thorough examination of the whole Epistle, sets the limit of date as A.D. 130–160" (Light. p. 310). "Thorough" means, however, nothing more than a careful perusal of every line of the Epistle, and the diligent following of every cue which the pseudo-Clement has supplied. For "*place, date*, and *authorship*," writes Dr. Lightfoot, "we are obliged to fall back on such slight indications as the homily from time to time affords" (p. 305). It is just the story of the Epistles to Virgins over again, and what was said above (pp. 9 sq., 63 sq.) might be said again if this were the fitting opportunity. These critics consider themselves competent to determine the dates of the whole of the Clementine Literature from internal evidence in calm indifference to the possibility that the various pseudo-Clements may have had views of their own. Internal evidence supplied by a *falsarius* and expounded by critics as learned as they are unsuspicious, must of necessity lead to results which it requires no prophet to foretell, and which are strikingly illustrated in the case of the Epistles to Virgins.

If, however, modern criticism should abandon the hopeless task of determining the date of these Epistles from internal evidence, what new method will it adopt? A number of coincidences between Antiochus' *Hom.* 21, and a *Sermo* of Antonius Melissa has been produced. The Epistles to Virgins

cannot be earlier than *Hom.* 21. What will critics do with these coincidences?

Will they set them aside as accidental? More than one critic in his zeal for Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians has said of *Peregrinus Proteus* that it proves that verbal coincidences between two writers prove nothing. If this be so, if learned criticism is now, for the sake of upholding one or two ecclesiastical writings, compelled to acknowledge that its unwearied appeal to verbal coincidences has been a great mistake, something will be gained to the cause of truth which is never really advanced by unsound arguments. There are books of the New Testament that depend upon verbal coincidences for proof that they were known in the earliest times. Of course, if this method of proof is untrustworthy it must be abandoned. Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians is mainly valuable for the verbal coincidences with these books which it supplies. It will be strange indeed if for the sake of upholding it as the genuine work of Clement of Rome it is to be robbed of its chief importance. It could be shown with merciless force that the verbal coincidences which are to the discredit of this Epistle are in number and in strength out of all proportion to those to the credit of some books of the New Testament. If it must be done, it must, for truth is one of the very few things to which the words "at any price" properly belong. It is, however, a pity that such strong language was used concerning the author of *Supernatural Religion*. His fault was only that he had this, that, and the other excuse for evading the force of verbal coincidences. We have every confidence, however, that more temperate counsels will eventually prevail, and that the school of criticism, with which our quarrel lies, will see the inconsistency of their position and fairly face the question of verbal coincidences and their value. It is simply unreasonable to contend that these coincidences are lawful arguments when urged in favour of books of the New Testament, and unlawful when urged against such writings as the Epistles of Clement. The inconsistency is so barefaced that it must sooner or later be abandoned. We might say to critics of this school, in the words of S. James, "Out of the same mouth proceedeth blessing and cursing. My brethren, these things ought not

so to be. Doth a fountain send forth at the same place both sweet water and bitter?" We have had personal experience both of the "blessing" and of the "cursing," and have learned that modern criticism, so far as verbal coincidences are concerned, is governed in the sending forth of its "sweet" and "bitter" words simply by the object for which the argument from these coincidences is applied.

The coincidences between Antiochus and Antonius Melissa may, however, possibly be met, not by saying that they are accidental, but by postulating an earlier commonplace writer besides Maximus, to whom both Antiochus and Antonius were indebted. In *Peregrinus Proteus* we ventured to point out between Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians and Stobæus a very remarkable coincidence of the same kind as those of which we are now speaking. Dr. Lightfoot in 1869, writing in cold blood, and with no fear of consequences before his eyes, pointed out the use in a certain sentence of this Epistle of Greek lines some of them belonging to Sophocles' *Ajax* and the rest to a fragment of Euripides' *Æolus*. This learned editor not only pointed out the use of these lines, but actually printed Clement's words as a quotation. He did more, for he proceeded to show that in a following sentence the remainder of the fragment was used, and in a note said, "The resemblance here confirms the conjecture that in the earlier passage Clement has the words of Euripides in his mind" (p. 122). He even remarked: "Clement's text seems to embody some anapæstic fragments." The conjecture that the lines were used by Clement has plainly a good deal to say for itself. With this conjecture we had nothing at all to do; it was not ours, but Dr. Lightfoot's. He, however, omitted to point out that these two sets of lines, the one from Sophocles the other from Euripides, could be found in Stobæus separated only by three lines, and that there is no other place where the *whole* of the fragment of *Æolus* can be read. Our share in the business was simply to supply this considerable omission, and to point out the natural inference, namely, that the writer of the Epistle to the Corinthians had Stobæus before his eyes. It must not be supposed that it was mere chance that enabled us to supply Dr. Lightfoot's omission. The *Florilegium* of Stobæus is not a common book in private

libraries. It was not in ours. We took a great deal of trouble to obtain a copy, and for no other reason than that we were persuaded from things which we already knew concerning Clement's Epistle that we should find from Stobæus how it came to pass that the lines of Sophocles were combined with those of Euripides. We did not expect to find, what we actually did find, the two sets of lines staring us in the face in the same place. Common sense required of us to add this coincidence to the others already in our hands, and to draw the inevitable inference that the First Epistle to the Corinthians belongs to the great Clementine family, every member of which is a fraud. Quite apart however from the way in which the knowledge of the coincidence between Clement's Epistle and Stobæus came into our possession the coincidence is remarkable. How was it met by learned criticism? It could not be denied; it was not discussed; it was not explained. It was once or twice mentioned, but mostly it was passed by in silence. If it had been with a book of the New Testament enough would have been made of it. It was, however, with Stobæus, and that fact made an amazing difference in the estimate of its value. There was one gentle suggestion, that haply Clement was not thinking either of Sophocles or Euripides, the critic, that is, seeking to evade the force of the coincidence in the same way as a notable author seeks to evade the force of other awkward coincidences. The coincidence is, however, so remarkable that the theory that it is accidental can hardly find any very general acceptance.

Its force can be got rid of in another way. It may be suggested that there was some earlier commonplace writer to whom both Clement and Stobæus were indebted. It may be well to consider what the answer is which that school of ecclesiastical criticism which is the most prominent among us thinks to be the proper one under such circumstances. In what does this suggestion differ from that made from time to time by the author of *Supernatural Religion* of an apocryphal Gospel to which awkward coincidences may be referred? Why should not the suggestion be as good in his mouth as in that of any other critic? His reputation for orthodoxy does not stand very high, no doubt,

but no one will venture to give that as a reason, whatever may be *thought*. This suggestion is, however, not allowed to the author of *Supernatural Religion*. Speaking of one of the fragments of Melito,—as to which we have a word or two to say presently,—Dr. Lightfoot (*vid. sup.* p. 59) says "If this be a genuine fragment, the inference is obvious. The author of *Supernatural Religion* will no doubt be ready here as elsewhere to postulate any number of unknown apocryphal Gospels which shall supply the facts thus assumed by Melito. The convenience of drawing unlimited cheques on the bank of the unknown is obvious" (*Contemp. Rev.*, Feb. 1876, p. 482). Here, then, is the proper answer to the suggestion of an "unknown apocryphal" commonplace writer to whom both Clement and Stobæus may have been indebted. If this is not the proper answer, why is it not? Is the balance to credit at the bank of the unknown to stand only in the names of upholders of ecclesiastical documents? It will be said perhaps that the cases are not parallel, inasmuch as the Epistle of Clement is certainly genuine, and consequently that its author could not have borrowed from Stobæus. We reply that the cases are strictly parallel. Dr. Lightfoot points to certain coincidences and pleads their force. The author of *Supernatural Religion* in reply contends that our Gospels were not in existence in Melito's time, and that therefore Melito could not have taken his statements from them, and so suggests that Melito derived them from some apocryphal source. We too point to a very remarkable coincidence and plead its force. If it is said in reply that the *Florilegium* of Stobæus was not in existence in Clement's day, and that therefore the coincidence in question must be referred to some unknown earlier commonplace writer, what is this but the argument or supposed argument of *Supernatural Religion* over again? The suggestion simply begs the whole question. We deny the genuineness of Clement's Epistle, and we point to the coincidence with Stobæus as one amongst a multitude of proofs that it is not genuine. It is no answer to this to affirm that the Epistle is genuine, and that the coincidence must therefore be explained away in some manner. The suggestion might possibly be worth something if critics were prepared to do one or other of two things,

either to point to some earlier commonplace writer known to and used by the earliest ecclesiastical writers, or else to say that they had carefully examined the question of the genuineness of Clement's Epistle, and were ready to meet us at every point. If, in particular, they could say that they had carefully searched the writings of Clement of Alexandria, and were prepared to prove that the passages which Clement of Alexandria has in common with Clement's Epistle were copied out of it, it would be something. But they cannot say this, because it would not be true. The charge was made long ago by Bernhard that this Epistle has been interpolated[1] and in no small measure borrowed from Clement of Alexandria. His accusation reached no farther; it did not in any degree touch the external testimony. On the face of it the accusation may *possibly* be true. That accusation was met by sneers, and strong language in plenty, but it was never grappled with in the only way in which it could effectually be dealt with, namely by the careful comparison of the two Clements the one with the other. To some of our readers who perhaps suppose that the editors and critics of this Epistle—some of them of great name—have been at all possible pains in examining all that concerns it, this assertion will seem absurd. It is nevertheless a fact. No editor whatever, early or late, has ever thoroughly examined Clement of Alexandria with a view to answering Bernhard's charge, or even to find out all the many points of contact that exist between the writings of Clem. Alex. and this Epistle. Proofs of this assertion are plentiful, but one will for the present suffice. Bernhard (Cotel. *Patr. Apost.*, ed. Clericus, i. p. 175) declared a passage which stands in *Ep.* i. 50 to be copied out of Clem. Alex.:—"Hæc usque ad *Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν* exscripta sunt ex *Clemente Alexandrino*, p. 519." *Either Bernhard or Leclerc gave a wrong reference.* Bernhard's words were diligently copied by critics. They stand in Potter's edition of Clem. Alex. (p. 610, note 4) in

[1] The charge of interpolation has been often made. It is made in Smith's *Dict. Gr. Rom. Biog.* There is not a word upon the question in Smith and Wace's *Dict. Chr. Biog.* Both are standard works. Which is "Philip sober"? Dr. Lightfoot's edition preserves a profound silence on such trivial matters.

company with his sneers at Bernhard. They stand in Migne's edition with the wrong reference. They may doubtless be found elsewhere. Perhaps editors have thought the repeating Bernhard's words and wrong reference to be a keen satire upon him, and an overwhelming answer to his charge. These repetitions remain, however, as a standing witness to the want of diligence among editors and critics. It seems scarcely credible, and it is not creditable, but it is nevertheless the fact, that no editor has ever thought it worth his while to find the right page, though it may be found in one minute by so simple an expedient as consulting the index of Scripture texts in Potter's edition of Clem. Alex. It is charming to listen to Potter's remarks upon the passage,[1] which consists of a quotation (Ps. xxxii. 1, 2) accurately taken from the LXX. followed by two or three lines which he considers to have been suggested by S. Paul, who quotes the text in Rom. iv. 7, 8. It is equally charming to listen to Dr. Lightfoot's remarks upon the same lines as they stand in Clement's Epistle, for he makes the same obvious suggestion (and not less charming to listen to Harnack). Neither of them knows that the two Clements have the passage in common. He will be a clever man, and one fertile in excuses, who will give a common-sense reason why Clement of Alexandria, who in the same place quotes Rom. vi., should copy a passage out of Clement's Epistle when he could get all he wanted out of the language of S. Paul in Rom. iv. Even if a critic be found able to rise to the occasion and explain this, he will not be able to explain away the want of diligence among editors and critics, which is revealed by the fact that it has remained for this year of grace 1884 to supply the true page (p. 389) in Bernhard's reference. The passage in question will be found in *Strom.* ii. 15, p. 463 (Potter). The remark was made above (p. 36) that printing has in no small measure killed independent research. The remark is a just one, and abundantly illustrated by the

[1] Γέγραπται γάρ, "Μακάριοι, ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι· μακάριος ἀνήρ, ᾧ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν, οὐδὲ ἔστιν ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ δόλος." οὗτος ὁ μακαρισμὸς ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐκλελεγμένους ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. "Καλύπτει μὲν γὰρ ἀγάπη πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν."—Clem. Alex. *Strom.* ii. 15, p. 463.

editions of Clement's Epistles. Editors have industriously copied their predecessors' numerous references to Clement of Alexandria sometimes even when the references were false, but no editor and no critic has ever attempted a comparison between the writings of Clement of Alexandria and the Epistle to the Corinthians such as would explain the supposed fondness of the Alexandrian father for his Roman namesake. If such a comparison had ever been attempted the passage which has been spoken of must necessarily have been found and discussed.

Though Dr. Lightfoot in no place whatever in his edition of Clement's Epistle shows any knowledge of the passage found by Bernhard and lost by succeeding critics, he nevertheless in his appendix volume quotes from that passage as it stands in Clem. Alex. In a note on *Ep. ad Cor.* ii. 16 (p. 333), speaking of the interpretation of 1 Pet. iv. 8 (*charity covereth a multitude of sins*), he says "Clement of Alexandria is hardly consistent with himself. In *Strom.* ii. 15 (p. 463) he explains it of God's love in Christ which forgives the sins of men; whereas in" etc. 1 Pet. iv. 8 is not separated by so much as one word from the passage in question. In using the word "Christ" (see note to last page), Dr. Lightfoot actually quotes from it. He is nevertheless silent as to the fact which has been pointed out. How is this silence to be explained? It would be an insult to suggest that he did not consult the page of Clem. Alex. to which he refers his readers. We cannot suppose that if he had observed this fresh proof, as he would think it, of the Alexandrian father's fondness for his Roman namesake, he would not have mentioned it, not perhaps on p. 333, but in the *Addenda*, p. 441, where he gives the various readings of the passage in question, and where the readings of Clem. Alex. are wanted, or at least in the *Appendix* to the *Addenda*, where omissions are supplied. We can only suppose that he did not observe the passage, that he read it as doubtless he and others had often before read it, without recognising it (*vid. sup.* p. 37).

Let it not be supposed that we have brought to light the circumstances, curious from first to last, which surround this said passage simply for the sake of wounding the feelings of

one for whom in his high position as bishop in the Church of Christ we ought to and indeed have every respect. It is unfortunately the necessity of our case to be compelled to show that modern criticism, even in the person of its most illustrious exponent, is not infallible, that it is liable to mistakes, that it does not always see what is quite plain to be seen, and that it is not careful to find all the evidence that concerns the documents which it upholds and expounds with so much learning, scholarship, and earnestness. We need hardly say that it is not in these last respects that we call modern criticism in question. Great gifts of learning and scholarship may, however, exist without other gifts which are no less necessary. Certainly during our study of Clement's Epistles no references have been found so fruitful as those which Dr. Lightfoot's edition supplies. This will be abundantly proved before we have done with Clement's Epistles.

Returning to the thread of our argument, our contention is that the genuineness of Clement's First Epistle to the Corinthians has never been seriously examined, and that, consequently, it is no answer at all to the inference drawn from the coincidence between this Epistle and Stobæus to urge that there may have been some earlier commonplace writer to whom both Clement and Stobæus were indebted. On behalf of Stobæus we claim certain property which is found in the Epistle. Stobæus is the sole owner of the fragment from *Æolus*. It is for those who uphold the Epistle to *prove* its innocence of the theft.

This digression grew up out of our supposition that perhaps critics may suggest that the coincidences between Antiochus and Antonius Melissa are to be explained by postulating an unknown earlier commonplace writer. We now reply that the suggestion is inadmissible, that it is at best "a cheque upon the bank of the unknown," which is not recognised by modern criticism when it contends against the author of *Supernatural Religion*. If the argument is inadmissible in the one case it is inadmissible in the other.

The existence of these coincidences, it will be remembered, was mentioned by us as one of our reasons for not carrying the investigations into the Epistles to Virgins farther than has been already done. We desire above all things that the

question of the true value to be placed upon verbal coincidences should be fairly faced. It cannot be left where it is. If we proceed farther, there is less chance of this being done. Coincidences would multiply, difficult questions might arise, and we might be told once more that "life is short and art is long, and that a plain man has no time to spare" for such investigations. We decide, therefore, to leave the questions concerning the Epistles to Virgins as they stand at present. We are content to wait and watch what critics will do with them.

We have, however, another reason for breaking off the inquiry at this point. The Epistles to Virgins have amply served our purpose. They have enabled us to give an effectual reply to the boast of the most prominent school of ecclesiastical criticism in this country, that its illustrious members have so thoroughly explored the fields of ancient ecclesiastical literature that nothing now remains to be done but for all—the greater luminaries and the lesser lights alike—to rest and be thankful, to compare notes one with another, and to expound with a reverent spirit those thoughts and opinions of the ancient Fathers which a kind Providence has happily preserved. No one will now venture to deny that these great critics have expounded the Syriac Epistles to Virgins in happy ignorance that what may fairly be called their Greek version could without difficulty be found in a book commonly referred to by themselves. No one can deny that Dr. Lightfoot in his *Veterum Testimonia* to Clement's Epistle to the Corinthians has directed his readers both to the Epistles to Virgins and to the *Homilies* of Antiochus in blissful unconsciousness that the one is the *alter ego* of the other. No one can deny that for 130 years critics great and small have been content to look no farther than the contents of the Epistles themselves for their explanation. No one will venture to assert that there has at any time been any difficulty whatever in finding the evidence (or any part of it) concerning them that has been produced in this volume. Critics great and small have been content—this is beyond dispute—to play the part of the immortal "Antiquary."[1] It requires learning and scholar-

[1] If any one desires to see the "Antiquary" in his glory, he should read the article upon the "Epistle to Diognetus" in Smith and Wace's *Dict. Chr. Biog.* He will find some eleven columns of closely printed matter, the whole of which,

ship to play this part satisfactorily, and no one will question their great gifts in these respects. The part requires, too, no small measure of unsuspiciousness, and they have claimed this for themselves as though it were one of Heaven's best gifts, while still suspicion of possible danger is an instinct common to man and beast alike. They have boasted themselves to be wiser than S. Paul, for they have forgotten the wise caution which is to be inferred from S. Paul's words to the Thessalonians :—" The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every Epistle : so I write." And Antiochus, whose *Homilies* are extant " if that which no one reads can be said to be extant," has been the " Edie Ochiltree," with his " I mind the bigging o't," to confound the picture of church life and development which these critics have first read into and then read out of these Epistles, and to prove the futility of their " infallible touchstones of supposed antiquity." It is a pleasant and a primitive picture truly—that ancient father of the Church with eyes uplifted, while loving hands anoint his sacred body, his own hands outstretched, the one grasping the book with the device, " The Law, The Prophets, and The Lord," the other veiled, to receive the kiss of rapturous men and maidens. The hand that painted it was a *falsarius* of the seventh century or later. He might be placed later, but the picture would gain nothing.

The lesson to be learned, if painful, is at least salutary. It can be best deduced from a criticism upon *Peregrinus Proteus.* The author of this volume was instructed that " students of certain subjects " may know their special subject thoroughly, but " know nothing *about* it." Such a student need not be this, that, or the other, " but it is necessary that he shall *know what is known* on the subject of ancient literature ; in default of such knowledge he runs the risk of making himself ridiculous in the eyes of men whose special knowledge may be far less than his, but who know how far their knowledge will carry them, and what facts it has to reckon with beyond its province." We have exchanged more than one amicable letter with this writer, and we are sure that in the strife of controversy he can take as well as give, and that he will

except one sentence and a list of authorities, of which no use is made, proceeds from the writer's "inner consciousness."

pardon us if we turn the tables upon himself by suggesting that the words which he has placed in italics might be altered with advantage into *what may be known*. It is well to know what may be known "*about*" ancient, or what seem ancient, documents before proceeding to expound them, especially when such knowledge may be without difficulty obtained. It is well too for those persons who have the comfortable assurance that as they walk abroad in the fields of ancient literature they know all that is known about the various objects that meet their eye, not to forget that there may be some humble student, who lays no claim to universal knowledge, to whom it may be given to light upon a treasure which their feet have trodden indeed, but which their eyes have not seen, not so much because the treasure was hidden as that their eyes were holden. No one, we suppose, will now venture to deny that if for 130 years chapter after chapter and chapter after chapter of Clement's Epistles to Virgins have remained undiscovered in a Greek book not at all uncommonly referred to by the very persons who have pronounced judgment upon these Epistles, there may possibly be facts which Greek books can disclose as to another Epistle of Clement which, if they were known, would as certainly condemn it as the *Homilies* of Antiochus condemn the Epistles to Virgins.

To the criticism on *Peregrinus Proteus* under the second head, described on p. 1, this volume is the answer. Those readers to whom this answer may appear too sharp are invited to remember that if the warning to critics, that they were expounding late literary frauds as ancient writings, uttered in 1879 had been heeded, there would have been no occasion for this volume. Critics could, if they had been so minded, have found out for themselves all that has been told in the foregoing pages and much more besides, and might have made known their discoveries in such manner as best pleased them. They at any rate would be listened to. It is not yet too late for them to ascertain the fact that the main positions taken up by the writer of *Peregrinus Proteus* in that work are absolutely true.

APPENDIX.

A.

It has been pointed out on p. 59 that the MS. in which Cureton found the excerpt from "The First Epistle on Virginity, by Clement, bishop of Rome," contains also some fragments attributed to Melito. On p. 61 it is asserted that there is as much to be learned about these fragments as there is about the Epistles to Virgins. This assertion, which has now to be made good, applies primarily to the two to which Dr. Lightfoot's remarks, quoted on p. 59, apply.

In *Contemporary Review*, Feb. 1876, Dr. Lightfoot has an article on *Supernatural Religion*, in which he discusses the treatment of Melito in that volume. On p. 482 he quotes the whole of one fragment (No. xv., Otto,[1] i. p. 420), "not only because the author (of *Supernatural Religion*) has made it the subject of some criticisms, but because it exhibits in a concentrated form Melito's views of evangelical history and doctrine." After quoting it he says "the special value of this particular passage is that it gathers into a focus the facts of the evangelical history, on which the faith of Melito rested." He goes on to argue that these facts were derived from our four canonical Gospels. Everything clearly depends upon the authenticity of the fragment. If the fragment was written by Melito, the four Gospels were in his hands, and he becomes a very important witness to the existence of our Gospels in the second century.

Dr. Westcott (*Canon* p. 221) says that this fragment is "a very striking expansion of the early historic Creed of the Church, and deserves on every account to be quoted in full." Having quoted it he says "No writer could state the fundamental truths of Christianity more unhesitatingly or refer to the contents of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments with more perfect confidence."

The same fragment is quoted in full by Mr. Simcox in *Beginnings of the Christian Church* (p. 390), and he adds "This is not only orthodox theology—it is second century theology" (p. 392).

[1] The various remains of the writings of Melito can be most conveniently studied in Otto, *Corp. Apol. Christ.* vol. ix. (Jenæ 1872) p. 410 sq. Otto's numbering of the fragments is adopted in our remarks.

It is thus plain that a great deal depends upon the authenticity of this fragment. This question is easily disposed of by Mr. Simcox, who says that the fragment "is one of those only preserved in Syriac, but one where there is no reason to doubt (as there is with some) that the translator meant to ascribe it to the Bishop of Sardis of the second century" (p. 390). Mr. Simcox refers to one MS. only,—as if the fragment (No. xv.) were found in one only, which is not the case,—and even so hardly states the facts correctly. There are in different places of the MS. four excerpts. Of these the first (No. xiii.) is ascribed to "Melito, bishop of Sardis;" the second (No. xiv.) to "the same;" the third (No. xv.) simply to "Melito the bishop;" the fourth (No. xvi.) to "Melito, bishop of the city of Attica." Which Melito does the scribe mean by "Melito the bishop," for he plainly has two in his mind? Attica cannot be Sardis. A small portion of the fourth fragment is given by Cureton (*Spic. Syr.* p. 56) out of another Syriac MS., where it is ascribed to "Melito, bishop of Ittica." Attica and Ittica are the same in Cureton's opinion. More cannot be said than that the scribe *probably* means by "Melito the bishop," the Melito whom he has previously mentioned. But if so, the value of the ascription of No. xv. to Melito will depend upon the correctness of the ascription of No. xiii. to Melito. Of No. xv. there is in existence a shorter *Syriac* version, and also an *Armenian* version, in both of which it is ascribed to Irenæus. This fact ought to have been mentioned, even if it had been very summarily dismissed. It *is* mentioned by Dr. Westcott (p. 221), but he seems to think that it is sufficiently disposed of when he says that the "general tone" of the "few fragments that remain in the original Greek" "is so decided in its theological character as to go far to establish the genuineness of those which are preserved in the Syriac translation" (see also below, p. 113, note). Otto, as we shall see presently, speaks of yet another version (Arabic) of No. xv., where the ascription is to Hierotheus.

Now it is beyond measure strange that no one of these critics, to whom—one for this reason, and another for that—the question of authenticity was of such great importance, should have been at the trouble to make a thorough search for evidence affecting these fragments of Melito before dealing with them. Long before these critics wrote, part of No. xiii. (which alone of the Syriac fragments is expressly ascribed to Melito, bishop of Sardis) had been printed by Mai as itself part of an excerpt not from Melito, while the whole of it as part of a much longer passage, ascribed to the same author as the excerpt just named, had been printed by Mai and by Migne out of Mai.

On p. 409 sq. Otto speaks of fragment No. xv., and says that it

is ascribed to Irenæus in a Syriac and Armenian version, and adds "Idem fragmentum ex Arabica versione, quæ textum exhibit nostro simillimum, in lucem Ang. Maius in Spicilegio romano, t. iii. p. 704 s., præposito Hierothei ("apostolorum discipuli et Athenarum [sic] episcopi") nomine: Sub quo, ut jam Renanus (ap. Pitr. t. ii. p. lix.) vidit, depravatum latet Irenæi nomen; nam similes sunt literarum ductus, quibus arabice scribuntur Hierotheus et Irenæus." If Otto had looked back in Mai to p. 699 he might have found a clue which would, if he had followed it up, have given him fresh and very valuable evidence concerning these fragments. For in Mai's *Spic. Rom.* iii. p. 699 he would have found, if the figures used in the various references may be trusted, an Arabic version of part of fragment No. xiii. This fragment consists of two portions, the first short, the second of some length. Otto would have found half of the second or larger portion. But he would have found it expressly ascribed to Alexander, bishop of Alexandria. If he had been disposed to carry the investigation further, he would have found among the writings of Alexander in Migne's *Patrol. Græc.* vol. xviii. (p. 585 sq.) a *Sermo de Anima et Corpore*, in Syriac, with an *Additamentum*. In this last he would have found both parts of No. xiii., and, between them, the whole of the excerpt just mentioned as given by Mai. He would have found also that the conclusion of No. xv. closely resembles the conclusion of the *Sermo* and *Additamentum*. Or Otto might have read these in Mai's *Bibl. Nov. Patr.* ii. p. 529, out of which they were printed by Migne. Migne's volume was published in 1857. Critics, therefore, have had ample time to find important evidence affecting the authenticity of these fragments. They have preferred (the author of *Supernatural Religion* as well as the rest) to commit themselves to definite opinions upon the question, without looking for evidence that was quite accessible.

Mai's *Monitum* to the *Sermo* is given by Migne. He points out that the excerpt given by him in *Spic. Rom.* iii. p. 699 is found in the *Additamentum* and less exactly in the *Sermo*, and that a small fragment, given in Asseman. *Bibl. Or.* iii. p. 543 "ex Mocaffæi chronico Arabico," is found in *Serm.* 5. Mocaffæus ascribes this to Alexander, whom he calls "Romanus Patriarcha." Mai explains away the word "Romanus," and supposes Alexander of Alexandria to be intended. He accounts for the *Additamentum*, and explains his reasons for printing it, as follows:—

Quin adeo sermonis hujus duæ videntur exstitisse apud Alexandrinos, sive apud Orientales, editiones; quandoquidem in codice Syr. Vat., post integrum sermonem, aliud attexitur ejusdem fragmentum, non sine paucis variis lectionibus. Ut

vero existimem, interpretationem Arabicam ex secunda Syriaca esse derivatam, utor hoc indicio, quod Arabicum codicis 101 fragmentum cum illo posteriore Syriaco magis congruit quam cum priore. Itaque etiamsi decreveram additamentum illud omittere, quia valde similis sermoni integro videbatur, attamen quia postea comperi partem Arabicam cum hac potius parte Syriaca conspirare, ne mei argumenti vim ullatenus infirmarem, hanc quoque Syriacam repetitionem minoribus saltem formis imprimendam curavi.

In Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 17,192 is found "A Sermon by the blessed Alexander on the Incarnation of our Lord and on Soul and Body." (See Cureton, *Corp. Ignat.* Introd. p. xxxiii.) This is the same *Sermo*[1] as the one printed by Mai, but it is not followed as in his MS. by the *Additamentum*.

We shall now give in Cureton's translation fragment No. xiii. followed by the whole of the *Additamentum* in parallel columns with those portions of the *Sermo* to which it relates.

By Meliton, Bishop of Sardis.

From the Discourse on the Soul and Body.

For this reason the Father sent His Son from heaven incorporeal, that when He was become incarnate through the womb of the Virgin, and was born man, He might save man, and collect those members of His which death had scattered when He divided man. *And further on.* The earth quaked, and its foundations were shaken; the sun fled, and the elements turned back, and the day was changed; for they endured not that their Lord should hang upon a tree; and the *whole* creation was wonderstruck, marvelling, and saying, "What new mystery, then, is this? The Judge is judged, and holds His peace; the invisible is seen, and is not ashamed; the incomprehensible is seized, and is not indignant; the immeasurable is measured, and doth not resist; the impassible suffereth, and doth not avenge; the immortal dieth, and answereth not a word; the celestial is interred, and endureth! What new mystery is this?" The *whole* creation was astonished. But when our Lord arose from the dead, and trode death under foot, and bound the strong one, and loosed man,—then the whole creation perceived, that for man's sake the Judge was condemned, and the invisible was seen, and the immeasurable was measured, and the impassible suffered, and the immortal died, and the celestial was interred; for our Lord, when He was born man, was condemned in order that He might show mercy; was bound in order that He might loose; was seized upon in order that He might let go;

[1] For these facts we are indebted to the Rev. J. Dowden, D.D. (Pantonian Professor, Edinburgh), who very kindly inspected the MS. on our behalf. A description of it is given in Dr. Wright's *Syriac Catalogue*, pp. 778–780.

suffered in order that He might have compassion; died that He might save; was buried that He might raise up.—*Spic. Syr.* p. 52.

ADDITAMENTUM.

Igitur formam suam Deus visitare volens, quam ad imaginem ac similitudinem suam finxerat, postremis temporibus Filium suum incorporeum unicumque in orbem terrarum misit, qui in virgineo sinu incarnatus, homo perfectus nasceretur, ut perditum hominem erigeret, dispersa ejus membra recolligens. Secus enim, cur Christo moriendum fuit? Num ipse reus mortis erat? Cumque Deus esset, cur factus est homo? Cur ad terram descendit, qui in cœlo regnabat?[1] " Quis Deum coegit in terram " se demittere, de sancta Virgine " carnem sumere, fasciis in præ- " sepi involvi, lacte nutriri, in " Jordane baptizari, a populo " illudi, ligno configi, in terræ " sinu sepeliri, tertioque die ex " mortuis resurgere, redemptionis " causa animam dando pro " anima, pro sanguine sanguinem, " mortem pro morte obeundo? " Nam Christus moriens mortis " debitum, cui homo erat ob- " noxius, dissolvit. O novum " mysterium atque ineffabile! " judex judicatus est: is qui a " peccatis absolvit, ligatus fuit: " illusum ei fuit, qui mundum " formaverat: extensus (in cruce) " est, qui cælum extenderat: " felle pastus ille est, qui manna " cibi loco suppeditavit; mor- " tuus est qui vivificat; sepul-

SERMO.

5. Age vero post hoc omne mortis servitium, et hominis corruptelam, visitavit Deus creaturam suam, quam ad imaginem similitudinemque propriam formaverat; idque egit, ne hæc perpetuum mortis ludibrium foret. Misit ergo Deus de cœlo incorporeum Filium suum, ut in virgineo sinu carnem sumeret; atque ita æque ac tu, homo factus est, ut hominem salvificaret, ejusque omnia sparsa membra colligeret. Etenim Christus, dum hominem personæ suæ copulavit, id adunavit quod separatione corporis mors disperserat. Passus est Christus, ut nos æternum vivamus.[2] "Secus enim cur " Christo moriendum erat? Num- " quid morte dignum commi- " serat? Cur carnem sibi induit, " qui gloria convestiebatur? Cum- " que Deus esset, cur homo " factus est? Et cum is in " cælo regnaret, cur in terram se " demisit, et in Virginis utero " incarnatus est? Quænam, oro, " necessitas Deum coegit in " terram descendere, carnem " assumere, panniculis in præ- " sepi involvi, lactante sinu ali, " baptismum a famulo suscipere, " in crucem tolli, terreno sepulcro " infodi, a mortuis tertia die " resurgere?" Quænam eum, inquam, necessitas compellebat? Satis exploratum est, opprobria

[1] "Totus hoc, quem virgulis distinguimus, locus exstat, ut in *Monito* diximus, ex ejusdem Alexandri nominatim sermone in Arabicam linguam translato, apud nos *Spicil. Rom.* t. III. p. 699."—Mai.

[2] "Sequentia, quæ uncis inclusimus, edita jam a nobis fuerant sub ejusdem Alexandri nomine in *Spicil. Rom.* tomo III. p. 699, inter excerpta Patrum ex codice Arabico Vaticano 101, quo continetur opus celebre monophysiticum, cui est titulus *Fides patrum.*"—Mai.

"cro traditus, qui mortuos "resuscitat. Obstupuere vir- "tutes, mirati sunt angeli, "trepidarunt elementa, res creata "universa concussa est, terra "tremuit, ejusque fundamenta "nutarunt; sol fugit, elementa "subversa sunt, lux diurna re- "cessit; quia Dominum suum "crucifixum cernere non susti- "nuerunt. Creatura attonita "dixit: quæ est hæc mysterii "novitas? Judex judicatur, et "tacet; invisibilis cernitur, nec "confunditur: capitur incom- "prehensibilis, nec indignatur: "immensus mensura continetur, "nec repugnat: impassibilis "patitur neque suam injuriam "ulciscitur: moritur immortalis, "neque conqueritur: cœlestis "sepelitur, idque æquo animo "fert. Quale hoc, inquam, "mysterium est? Certe crea- "tura stupore defigitur." Cum autem Dominus noster de morte surrexit eamque conculcavit, cum fortem alligavit, hominemque liberavit, tunc omnis creatura propter Adamum mirata est judicatum judicem, visum invisibilem, passum impassibilem, mortuum immortalem, cœlestem terra sepultum. Nam Dominus noster factus homo; damnatus est, ut misericordiam impertiretur; ligatus, ut solveret; comprehensus, ut liberaret; passus, ut passiones nostras sanaret; mortuus, ut vitam nobis redderet; sepultus, ut nos suscitaret. Etenim patiente Domino, nostro passa est ejus humanitas, quam similem homini habebat; atque illius passiones, qui ei similis erat, dissolvit; et moriens, mortem peremit. Idcirco in terram illum hominis gratia esse perpessum, ut eum morte expediret. . . . Re sane vera pertulit pro nobis dolores, ignominiam, cruciatus, necemque ipsam ac sepulturam. . . . Aspicite, o homines, aspicite omnes populi, prodigia nova! Ligno eum suspenderunt, qui terram expandit:[1] clavis eum confixerunt, qui mundi fundamenta stabilivit: circumscripserunt eum qui cœlum circumscripsit: vinxerunt illum, qui peccatores absolvit: aceto potaverunt illum, qui justitiæ potum præbuit; felle eum paverunt, qui vitæ cibum obtulit: manus pedesque ejus corruperunt, qui illorum manibus pedibusque medelam fecit: illius oculos vi clandendos curarunt, qui visum ipsis restituerat: sepulchro eum tradiderunt, qui mortuos tum ante suam passionem tum etiam in ligno pendens suscitavit. 6. . . . quo tempore Dominus noster mortem calcavit . . . fortes alligavit . . . Tunc cœlestes virtutes miratæ sunt, angeli obstupuerunt, tremuere elementa, creatura omnis concussa est, dum mysterium novum spectaculumque terrificum in orbe editum cerneret . . . quanquam terra nutaret . . . sol fugit, luna disparuit, sidera lumen suum subtraxerunt, dies cessavit. . . . 7. . . . siquidem neque creatura occasum ejus æquo animo tulit, neque ejusdem passionem elementa . . . Cuncta in Christi passione turbata fuerunt atque convulsa . . . Quale demum hoc est mirum mysterium . . .

Unus judicium subiit, millia plurima absoluta fuerunt. Ille autem homini quem salvaverat

[1] "Huc pertinet fragmentum quod Mocaffæus, ut in *Monito* dixi, ex Alexandri hoc sermone excerpsit."—Mai.

descendit, ut mortem persequens, rebellem hominum interfectricem occideret. Unus quippe judicium subiit, myriades liberatæ fuerunt: unus sepultus est, myriades resurrexerunt. Hic est inter Deum et homines Mediator: hic est omnium resurrectio et salus: hic est errantium dux, pastor hominum liberatorum, vita mortuorum, cherubinorum auriga, angelorum antesignanus, et rex regum; cui gloria in sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

similis factus, in cœli culmen conscendit, Patri haud aurum argentumve aut pretiosos lapides, sed hominem oblaturus quem ad imaginem similitudinemque suam formaverat; atque hunc Pater sua dextera extollens, sublimi solio collocavit, et populorum judicem fecit, angelicorum exercituum ducem, cherubinorum aurigam, veræ Hierusalem filium, virginis sponsum, et regem, per omnia sæcula sæculorum. Amen.

With the two conclusions here given compare No. xv.

From Meliton the Bishop, on Faith.

We have made collections[1] from the Law and the Prophets relative to those things which have been declared respecting our Lord Jesus Christ . . . *who rose from the dead*, who appeared to the Apostles, *who ascended to heaven*, *who sitteth on the right hand of the Father*, who is the rest of those that are departed, the recoverer of those who were lost, the light of those who are in darkness, the deliverer of those who are captives, *the guide of those who have gone astray*, the refuge of the afflicted, *the bridegroom of the Church*, *the charioteer of the Cherubim*, *the Captain of the angels*, God who is of God, the Son who is of the Father, Jesus Christ, *the King for ever and ever. Amen.*—*Spic. Syr.* p. 53.

The closing clauses here coincide partly with the *Additamentum* and partly with the *Sermo*. So the opening words of No. xiii. are in some respects nearer to the *Sermo* than to the *Additamentum*, *e.g.* "that He might save man," where the *Sermo* has "ut hominem salvificaret."

It appears then from the above that Melito's fragment No. xiii. is contained in its entirety in the *Additamentum*. The second part of this fragment begins in the *Additamentum*

[1] "The remarkable coincidence of these words with the fragment quoted by Eusebius (*H.E.* iv. 26) is a strong proof of the genuineness of the fragment: ἠξίωσας . . . γενέσθαι σοι ἐκλογὰς ἔκ τε τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν περὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν" (Westcott, *Canon* p. 222). The argument however is altogether the other way. It is strange to the last degree that Eusebius should happen to preserve in a few lines out of Melito's six books of *Collections from the Law and the Prophets* so remarkable a coincidence with a fragment, the heading (περὶ πίστεως) of which forms part of the coincidence, and shows that the fragment does not belong to the work cited by Eusebius. While dealing with the Epistles to Virgins we showed that remarkable coincidences with Eusebius are by no means necessary proofs of the genuineness of the works to which those coincidences belong.

with the words "terra tremuit" near the top of p. 112, that is to say, in the middle of the excerpt under the name of Alexander given by Mai in *Spic. Rom.* iii. p. 699. On p. 112 in the *Sermo* is the passage cited by Mocaffæus from Alexander —Alexander at any rate whether of Alexandria or not. The whole *Sermo* is found in another MS. ascribed to Alexander. The whole testimony, so far as No. xiii. is concerned, is in favour of the authorship of Alexander with the exception of the ascription of it to Melito of Sardis in Cureton's MS. No. xv. is closely related to the *Sermo* and *Additamentum*, but is ascribed in Cureton's MS. to "Melito the bishop," and elsewhere to Irenæus and to Hierotheus. The authorship of Melito has little support either for No. xiii. or No. xv. If his authorship is to be maintained, the testimony of not a few scribes must be thrown to the winds. If it *is* maintained, then no small addition to the remains of Melito will have been made. We do not, however, intend to pursue the subject farther. We are well aware that other resemblances to Alexander's *Sermo* can be found in the Syriac fragments, and that portions of these fragments can be also found elsewhere, and that a good many facts on this account will have to be reckoned with before these fragments can be placed upon a satisfactory footing. We have shown enough however for our purpose, which is simply to make plain that critics have dogmatized upon the fragments of Melito without first of all making sure that they had in their hands all the evidence which was accessible.

B.

Epistula Prior Beati Clementis Discipuli Petri Apostoli (*consisting of Thirteen Sections*).

On § 2 *vid. sup.* p. 44 and *Hom.* 130.

πρῶτον δεῖ πιστεύειν εἰς "Θεόν, ὅτι ἔστιν, καὶ τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν αὐτὸν μισθαποδότης γίνεται." πίστις γὰρ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα στήσεται· καὶ "'Ο δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται." *Vid. sup.* p. 44.

Scilicet qui revera pius est, ejus opera de fide ipsius testantur, quod verus sit fidelis, fide magna, fide perfecta, fide in Deo, fide quæ *luceat in bonis operibus*, ut omnium *pater* per Christum *glorificetur.—Ep.* i. 2.

'Ο δὲ ὄντως δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως πίστιν ἔχει ἐνεργῆ, πίστιν αὐξάνουσαν, πίστιν πεπληροφορημένην, πίστιν φωτίζουσαν ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς ἔργοις, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ τῶν ὅλων Θεός. πίστις ἀρχὴ κολλήσεως Θεοῦ. 'Ο τέλειος πιστὸς "λίθος ναοῦ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχει ἡτοιμασμένος εἰς οἰκοδομὴν Θεοῦ Πατρός, ἀναφερόμενος εἰς τὰ ὕψη, διὰ τῆς μηχανῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· ὅ ἐστι σταυρὸς σχοίνῳ χρώμενος τῷ Πνεύματι" κ.τ.λ. (Ignat. *Ephes.* 9.) *Hom.* i. (*περὶ πίστεως*).

Ii ergo, qui in veritate virgines sunt propter Deum, obœdiunt illi, qui dixit: *Justitia et fides ne tibi deficiant; alliga illas collo tuo, et invenies animæ tuæ misericordiam; et meditare bona coram Deo et coram hominibus. Semitæ justorum ergo veluti lux lucent, crescitque illarum lux, donec firma stet dies.—Ep.* i. 2. ,, p. 45.

Cf. *ὁ γὰρ οὕτω φιλόπτωχος ἀκούει τοῦ λέγοντος· "'Ελεημοσύναι καὶ πίστις μὴ ἐκλειπέτωσάν σε· ἄφαψαι δὲ αὐτὰς ἐπὶ σῷ τραχήλῳ, καὶ εὑρήσεις χάριν* (*et* ins. Tilm.), *προνοοῦ καλὰ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων." Καί· "'Οδοὶ δικαίων, ὁμοίως φωτὶ λάμπουσιν. προπορεύονται καὶ φωτίζουσιν ἕως κατορθώσῃ ἡ ἡμέρα."—Hom.* 98.

Ep. i. 2 sq.

Nam hominem Dei oportet in omnibus verbis factisque suis perfectum esse adornatumque in sua ratione agendi omnimoda honestate atque ordine et recte facere opera sua omnia. III. Sunt enim utriusque sexus virgines pulcrum quoddam exemplar, fidelibus et iis, qui futuri sunt fideles. Nomen autem solum sine operibus non introducet in regnum cælorum; si quis autem fuerit fidelis in veritate, is salvari poterit. Nam quod quis nomine tantum vocatur fidelis, operibus autem non est, non ideo illi contingit, ut sit revera fidelis. Igitur *ne quisquam decipiat vos vanis sermonibus erroris.* ,, p. 46.

Χρὴ οὖν τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καὶ λόγῳ ἐξηρτύσθαι καὶ κομεῖσθαι, καὶ εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν πάντα πράττειν, πρὸς ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν αὐτῷ πειθομένων. 'Ο γὰρ ἡγούμενος, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ προηγεῖσθαι, καλεῖται ἡγούμενος. Ὄνομα γὰρ ψιλὸν οὐκ εἰσάγει εἰς βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, οὐδὲ ὁ λόγος ἄπρακτος ὠφελεῖ τὸν ἀκούοντα· ἀλλὰ πρᾶξις ἐνδύναμος ἀληθινὸν ποιμένα ἀποδείκνυσιν.—Hom. 111.

Nam eo, quod nomen virginis cuipiam fuerit, si desunt illi opera præcellentia et pulcra et virginali statui convenientia, salvari non poterit. Etenim Dominus noster istiusmodo virginitatem *stultam* vocavit, prout dixit in evangelio; quæ quidem propterea, quod nec oleum habebat neque lumen, relicta fuit extra regnum cælorum et prohibita a gaudio sponsi et cum sponsi adversariis computata. Nimirum apud eos, qui tales sunt, solummodo est *species pietatis; virtutem autem ejus abnegant.* Apud se *existimant se esse aliquid, cum nihil sint, et errant. Unusquisque* ergo *exploret opera sua* seque ipse noscat; nam *vanum cultum* exhibet, quicumque virginitatem et sanctimoniam profitetur, *virtutem autem ejus abnegat.*

Ὁ νεανίσκος τοίνυν, τουτέστιν ὁ ἑαυτὸν εὐνουχίσας διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν, καὶ ἡ παρθένος, ἐὰν μὴ κατὰ πάντα τοιοῦτοι ὦσιν, ὥσπερ οἱ ἀληθινοὶ μιμηταὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὐ δύνανται σωθῆναι. Τὸ γὰρ λέγεσθαι παρθένον, καὶ τὰς ἀρετὰς μὴ ἔχειν ἀναλόγους, καὶ οἰκείους καὶ ἁρμοζούσας τῇ παρθένῳ, μωρὰν τὴν τοιαύτην παρθένον φησὶν ὁ κύριος. Ἀφεγγὴς γὰρ οὖσα καὶ ἀνέλαιος, ἔξω τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐγκλείεται, νυμφίου χαρᾶς στερηθεῖσα, καὶ μετὰ τῶν μισούντων τὸν νυμφίον λογισθήσεται. Δοκεῖ γὸρ εἶναί τι ἡ ἄπρακτος μηδὲν οὖσα, καὶ φρεναπατᾷ ἑαυτήν. Δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἕκαστος τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἐπιγινωσκέτω, ὅτι θρησκεία ἐστὶν μάταιος, παρθενίαν καὶ ἐγκράτειαν ὁμολογοῦντες ἔχειν, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἠρνημένοι.—*Hom.* 21.

Vid. sup. p. 49. Nostin' sicut vir in hunc agonem legitime descendere atque certare, cum hoc in virtute spiritus eligis, ut coroneris corona lucis teque (triumphantem, Funk), circumducant per *Jerusalem supernam?*—*Ep.* i. 5.

Ἀγώνισαι νομίμως ἀθλῆσαι, ἵνα τὸν στέφανον, ὃν ἥρετίσω, ἀπολαύῃς, καὶ στεφανηφόρος πομπεύσῃς (so also Tilman, *v.l.* ἀπέλθῃς) πρὸς τὴν ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ.

On § 4 *vid. sup.* p. 47 and *Hom.* 127.
On § 5 *vid. sup.* p. 89 sq. and *Hom.* 112.

Ep. i. 5 sq.

„ p. 53. Num intellegis et nosti, quam sit res honorabilis castimonia? Num intellegis, quam magna, quam excellens sit gloria virginitatis? VI. Uterus sanctæ virginis gestavit Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, Dei filium, et corpus, quod Dominus noster gessit et quo certamen suum fecit in hoc mundo, ex sancta virgine induerat. Hinc ergo intellege præstantiam et claritatem virginitatis. Vin' tu esse Christianus? Christum ergo imitare in omnibus.—*Ep.* i. 5 sq.

„ p. 54. Μέγα οὖν ἐστιν ἐν ἁγνείᾳ μένειν εἰς τὴν τιμὴν τῆς σαρκὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἐν ἀκαυχησίᾳ. ἐὰν γὰρ καυχήσηται, ἀπώλετο (Ignat. *ad Polyc.* 5) χρὴ δὲ καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς ἀρετάς, καθὼς εἴρηται, ἀναλόγως ἔχειν τῇ παρθενίᾳ. ὅτι ἡ παρθενία ἀνωτέρα πάντων ἐστίν. Παρθένος γὰρ μήτρα ἐκύησε τὸν Θεὸν Λόγον. ἐκ τούτου γνῶθι τὴν δόξαν τῆς παρθενίας. Οἱ γὰρ ἀφιερούμενοι τῷ Θεῷ, μιμηταὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γίνονται· φησὶν γάρ· "Μιμηταί

μου γίνεσθε, καθὼς κἀγὼ Χριστοῦ." Ἐν γὰρ τοῖς τοιούτοις φρονήμασιν, φρόνημα σαρκὸς οὐχ ὑπάρχει.—*Hom.* 21.

παρ' ἡμῖν δὲ τοῖς Χριστιανοῖς. . . . ἀφ' οὗ γὰρ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ υἱὸς ηὐδόκησεν ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας ἀχράντου Θεοτόκου, καὶ ἀειπαρθένου Μαρίας τῷ κόσμῳ ἐπιφανῆναι.—*Hom.* 21 (earlier).

Ep. i. 6 sq.

Christum ergo imitare in omnibus. Joannes legatus, qui ante Dominum nostrum venit, *quo major quisquam non fuit inter natos ex mulieribus*, sanctus Domini nostri nuntius, virgo fuit. Imitare ergo Domini nostri legatum, et esto amicus ejus in omnibus. Deinde Joannes, *qui super pectus Domini nostri recubuit, quem valde diligebat*, is quoque virgo fuit; neque enim sine causa Dominus noster illum diligebat. Paulus quoque et Barnabas et Timotheus cum reliquis aliis, *quorum nomina scripta sunt in libro vitæ*, hi, inquam, omnes castimoniam dilexerunt atque amarunt et in isthoc certamine cucurrerunt cursumque suum immaculate confecerunt ut Christi imitatores et tamquam filii Dei vivi. Set et Eliam et Elisæum aliosque multos viros sanctos invenimus vitam egisse cælibem atque immaculatam. His igitur si cupis similis fieri, fortiter illos imitare; dixit enim: *Seniores vestros honorate, cumque eorum vitæ rationem moresque videritis, fidem illorum imitemini.* Et iterum ait: *Imitemini me, fratres, sicut ego Christum.* VII. Illi ergo, qui Christum imitantur, strenue ipsum imitantur.

υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος . . . ὡς οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ φίλοι· ζήλωσον αὐτῶν τὴν πολιτείαν, γίνου ὡς ὁ Ἰωάννης, ὁ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πρόδρομος, ὁ ἄγνὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἄγγελος, καὶ ὡς ὁ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπιστήθιος τοῦ κυρίου, ὃν καὶ ἐφίλει ὁ κύριος ὡς ἀγνόν. Παῦλος, καὶ Βαρνάβας, καὶ Τιμόθεος, τὸν δρόμον τῆς ἁγνείας, καὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα, ἄσπιλον ἐτέλεσαν, ὡς ἀληθῶς μιμηταὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἠλιού, καὶ Ἐλισσαίου, καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν τὸν βίον τοιοῦτον εὑρήσεις, ἁγνόν, καὶ ἄμωμον. Εἰ οὖν τούτους θέλῃς μιμήσασθαι δυνατῶς, μιμοῦ πρεσβυτέρους, "Ὧν ἀναθεωροῦντες, φησίν, τὴν ἔκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς, μιμήσασθε καὶ τὴν πίστιν." Καὶ τό· "Μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε, κἀγὼ Χριστοῦ." Οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μιμηταί, δυνατῶς μιμοῦνται αὐτόν· οἱ τοιοῦτοι καὶ μακάριοί εἰσιν.—*Hom.* 112. *Vid. sup.* p. 64.

Ep. i. 7 sq.

Itaque nemo, qui virginitatem profitetur, sive frater sive soror, salvari poterit, nisi sit omnino sicut Christus, et sicut illi *qui sunt Christi.* Scilicet quicumque cælibem vitam agit secundum Deum, sive frater sive soror, castus ille est corpore et spiritu atque in cultura Domini sui assiduus; neque discedit ab eo aliorsum, sed quovis tempore famulatur in puritate et sanctitate in spiritu Dei, *sollicitus, quomodo placeat Domino suo*, estque sollicitus, ut quavis in re illi placeat.

Ἡ γὰρ ὄντως εὐνουχία, καὶ ἡ ὄντως παρθενία ἐν κυρίῳ, ἁγία ἐστὶν τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ἀπερισπάστως καὶ εὐπαρέδρως τῷ κυρίῳ λατρεύουσα ἐν Πνεύματι Θεοῦ, καθαρῶς καὶ ἀμιάντως ἀρέσκουσα τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ ἀεὶ μεριμνῶσα πῶς ἀρέσει αὐτῷ, ,, p. 48.

Talis a Domino nostro non recedit, verum spiritu cum Domino suo est, sicut scriptum est: *Estote sancti, sicut ego sanctus sum, dicit Dominus.* VIII. Neque enim si quis nomine tantum sanctimonialis vocatur, jam sanctimonialis est: verum omnino sanctimonialis esse debet et corpore et spiritu, etc.

καὶ ἓν Πνεῦμά ἐστιν πρὸς κύριον, καθὼς γέγραπται· "Ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιός εἰμι," λέγει κύριος. Οὐ γὰρ ὀνόματι μόνον ψιλῷ ὁ ἅγιος, ἁγιός ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ ὁ ἅγιος, τῷ σώματι καὶ τῷ πνεύματι.—*Hom.* 21.

On § 8 *vid. sup.* p. 76 and *Hom.* 130.

Ep. i. 8 sq.

Vid. sup. p. 76.

Hanc ob causam merito dicit in generationem istiusmodi: *Non habitabit spiritus meus in hominibus in perpetuum, quia caro sunt.* Omnis ergo, in quo spiritus *Christi* non est, *is* non est ejus, sicut scriptum est: *Recessit Spiritus Dei a Saul, et vexavit eum spiritus nequam, qui super eum emissus fuerat a Deo.*

IX. Voluntati Spiritus Dei consentit quisquis, in quo est Spiritus Dei; et quia consentit Spiritui Dei, ideo carnis opera mortificat vivitque Deo, subigens et *in servitutem redigens corpus suum affligensque illud, ut aliis prædicans pulcrum sit exemplum* et imago fidelibus ac versetur in operibus Spiritu sancto dignis, ut ne *reprobus fiat*, sed probatus sit coram Deo et coram hominibus.

Ab eo, inquam, *homine, qui Dei est, desiderium carnis* omne abest, inprimis autem ab utriusque sexus virginibus; sed fructus eorum omnes sunt *fructus spiritus* et vitæ, ac veraciter sunt civitas Dei et habitacula et *templa*, in quibus commoratur et *habitat Deus* versaturque sicut in sancta civitate cælesti. Ideo autem *mundo apparetis sicut luminaria, quia ad verbum vitæ attenditis;* atque ita estis revera laus et gloria ac lætitiæ corona et gaudium bonorum servorum in Domino nostro Jesu Christo. Omnes enim, qui videbunt nos, *agnoscent vos esse semen, cui benedixit Dominus,* esse veraciter semen inclitum

"Οὐ μὴ γὰρ καταμείνῃ, φησίν, τὸ Πνεῦμά μου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σάρκας." "Εἴ τις τοίνυν Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ οὐκ ἔχει, οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ." Ὁ γὰρ Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἔχων, Πνεύματι Θεοῦ στοιχεῖ, καὶ Πνεύματι Θεοῦ τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῖ, καὶ ζῇ τῷ Θεῷ ὑποπιάζων καὶ δουλαγωγῶν τὴν σάρκα, ἵνα ἐνοικήσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα τὸ εἰρηνικόν. Καὶ φρουρούμενος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, ποιήσει καρπὸν πίστεως, ἀρετῆς, σοφίας, ἁγνείας κ.τ.λ.—*Hom.* 130.

Ἐν γὰρ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκ ἔστιν φρόνημα σαρκικόν. Ἀλλὰ πάντες οἱ καρποὶ τοῦ πνεύματος, οἱ σωτήριοι, ἐν οἷς οἰκεῖ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἐμπεριπατεῖ. Ἐν οἷς φαίνονται ὡς φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ, λόγον ζωῆς ἔχοντες ὡς ἀληθῶς, καὶ καύχημα, καὶ δόξα τῆς εὐσεβείας ὑπάρχοντες. "Ἡ γὰρ ἱεραρχία . . . καὶ τελεσιουργεῖν," ἵνα πᾶς ὁ ὁρῶν ὑμᾶς, ἐπιγνώσηται ὅτι σπέρμα εὐλογημένον ἐστὲ ὑπὸ κυρίου, ἀληθῶς σπέρμα ἔντιμον, "Βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν Θεοῦ," κληρονόμοι ἀφθάρτων καὶ ἀμαράντων ἐπαγγελιῶν, "Ὧν ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ ἴδεν, καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἃ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ

sanctumque et *regnum sacerdotale, gentem sanctam, gentem hereditatis*, heredes divinarum promissionum, quæ nec corrumpuntur nec marcescunt: *id quod oculus non vidit nec auris audivit nec in cor hominis adscendit, quod Deus præparavit diligentibus illum et mandata ejus observantibus.*

Θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν," καὶ φυλάττουσιν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ.— *Hom.* 122.

Ep. i. 11.

Ne multi inter vos sint doctores, fratres, neque omnes sitis prophetæ. Qui in verbis suis non prævaricatur, hic homo perfectus est, potens domare et subigere totum corpus suum. (ten texts follow which are not in *Hom.* 22).

Hom. 22.

Ὁ δὲ Ἰάκωβος· "Εἴ τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ πταίει, οὗτος τέλειος ἀνὴρ δυνατὸς χαλιναγωγῆσαι καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα." . . . καὶ πάλιν· "Μὴ πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί μου, εἰδότες ὅτι τὸ μεῖζον κρῖμα ληψόμεθα" (four texts follow which are not in *Ep.* i. 11). *Vid. sup.* p. 78.

"Ἀμεινον οὖν (om.) ἐστιν σιωπᾶν καὶ εἶναι, ἢ λαλοῦντας (λαλοῦντα) μὴ εἶναι. καλὸν τὸ διδάσκειν, ἐὰν ὁ λέγων ποίῃ. εἷς οὖν ὁ (om.) διδάσκαλος· ὡς (ὃς) εἶπεν, καὶ ἐγένετο· καὶ ἃ σιγῶν δὲ πεποίηκεν, ἄξια τοῦ Πατρός ἐστιν. Ὁ λόγον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (om.) κεκτημένος ἀληθῶς δύναται καὶ τῆς ἡσυχίας αὐτοῦ ἀκούειν, ἵνα ᾖ τέλειος, ἵνα δι' ὧν λαλεῖ πράσσῃ, καὶ δι' ὧν σιγᾷ γινώσκηται. Οὐδὲν γὰρ (om.) λανθάνει τὸν κύριον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ κρυπτὰ ἡμῶν ἐγγὺς αὐτοῦ (αὐτῷ) εἰσιν (ἐστίν)."

Timeamus ergo judicium, quod imminet doctoribus. Grave enimvero judicium subituri sunt doctores illi, qui *docent et non faciunt;* et illi, qui Christi nomen mendaciter assumunt dicuntque se docere veritatem, at *circumcursant et temere vagantur* seque exaltant atque *gloriantur in sententia carnis suæ.* Isti sunt sicut, *cæcus, qui cæco ducatum præstat et in foveam cadunt ambo.* At condemnabuntur, propterea quod garrulitate sua, etc.

Φοβηθῶμεν οὖν τὸ κρῖμα τῶν διδασκάλων. περισσότερον γάρ ἐστι τῶν λεγόντων, καὶ μὴ ποιούντων, τὸ κρῖμα· ψευδώνυμον γνῶσιν διδασκόντων, καὶ ἐμβατευόντων εἰκῇ καὶ φυσιουμένων ἀπὸ τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκός, τυφλῶν τυφλοὺς ὁδηγούντων, καὶ ἀμφοτέρων εἰς βόθυνον πιπτόντων. ἐκ γὰρ ἐξόδου λόγου αὐτῷ γνωσθήσεται ἀνήρ.

Ep. i. 11 sq.

At condemnabuntur, propterea quod garrulitate sua et vana doctrina *animalem* docent *sapientiam* atque *inanem fallaciam* verborum persuasionis *sapientiæ humanæ, secundum voluntatem principis potestatis aëris et spiritus illius, qui vim suam exserit in immorigeris; secundum institutionem hujus sæculi et non secundum doctrinam Christi.* Verumtamen si accepisti *sermonem scientiæ* aut *sermonem doctrinæ aut prophetiæ aut ministerii*, laudetur *Deus, qui largiter opitulatur omnibus, qui omnibus dat nec opprobrat.* Illo igitur charismate, quod a Domino accepisti, illo inservi fratribus

πλήν, εἰ εἰληφας χάρισμα πνευματικόν, καὶ λόγον σοφίας, ἢ γνώσεως, ἢ διδασκαλίας, ἢ προφητείας, ἢ διακονίας, εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς ὁ πάμπλουτος, "ὁ Θεός, ὁ διδοὺς πᾶσιν ἁπλῶς, καὶ μὴ ὀνειδίζων." „ p. 81.

pneumaticis, prophetis, qui dignoscant Dei esse verba ea, quæ loqueris; et enarra quod accepisti charisma in ecclesiastico conventu ad ædificationem fratrum tuorum in Christo. Nam bona sunt et eximia ea, quæ utilitatem hominibus Dei afferunt, si apud te revera sunt. XII. Pulcrum quoque atque utile est *visitare pupillos et viduas*, inprimis pauperes, qui multos habent liberos, *ante omnia autem domesticos fidei*. Sunt hæc sine controversia officium servorum Dei, eaque præstare pulcrum ipsis atque decorum est. Porro etiam hoc convenit fratribus in Christo et justum atque decorum ipsis est, ut visitent eos, qui a malis spiritibus vexantur.

Σὺ οὖν—τοὺς τοιούτους. Χάρισμα ἔχεις παρὰ κυρίου, διακόνησον τοῖς πνευματικοῖς, τοῖς γινώσκουσιν, ὅτι ἃ λέγεις, κυρίου ἐστίν, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ἀδελφότητος, ἐν πάσῃ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ πραότητι· ὅπερ ἐστὶ καλὸν καὶ ὠφέλιμον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.—*Hom.* 47.

ὅτι δὲ καλὸν τὸ ἐπισκέπτεσθαι ὀρφανοὺς καὶ χήρας ἐν τῇ θλίψει αὐτῶν, καὶ πολυτέκνους πένητας, μάλιστα δὲ πρῶτον καὶ τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως, πᾶσιν πρόδηλα καὶ ἀναντίρρητά ἐστιν· Ὅτι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο καλὸν καὶ ὠφέλιμον τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀδελφότητι τοὺς δαιμονιῶντας ἐπισκέπτεσθαι.—*Hom.* 99.

Ep. i. 12.

Vid. sup. p. 84.

Porro etiam hoc convenit fratribus in Christo et justum atque decorum ipsis est, ut visitent eos, qui a malis spiritibus vexantur, atque orent et adjurationes super eos faciant utiliter, precibus, quæ acceptæ sint coram Deo, non vero verbis splendidis multisque, compositis atque præparatis, ut hominibus appareant eloquentes ac felicis memoriæ. Sunt autem similes *tibiæ sonanti aut tympano tinnienti* garrulitatem eorum, et nihil juvant eos, super quos adjurationes faciunt, sed proferunt verba terribilia, quibus homines terrificant, non vero agunt ibi cum vera fide secundum doctrinam Domini, qui dixit: *Hoc genus non exit nisi in jejunio ac precibus* firmis et continuis atque intenta mente. Itaque sancte orent petantque a Deo cum alacritate omnique sobrietate et castitate, sine odio et sine malitia. Sic adeamus fratrem aut sororem ægrotantes, eosque invisamus eo modo, quo hoc fieri decet: sine dolo et sine pecuniæ amore et sine tumultu et sine

Hom. 99.

ὅτι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο καλὸν καὶ ὠφέλιμον τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀδελφότητι τοὺς δαιμονιῶντας ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, καὶ εὔχεσθαι ἐπάνω αὐτῶν εὐχὴν τῷ Θεῷ ἀρέσκουσαν, πιστῶς, καὶ μὴ ἐκ συνθέσεως λόγων πολλῶν, ἢ μελέτας ἐξορκισμῶν πρὸς ἐπίδειξιν ἀνθρωπαρεσκείας, πρὸς τὸ φανῆναι εὐλάλους, ἢ μνήμονας ἡμᾶς, δίκην αὐλοῦ ἠχοῦντας πρὸς τοὺς ἐνεργουμένους, φλυαρίας καὶ βαττολογίας, καὶ οὐκ ἐν πίστει ἀληθείας, καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὁ κύριος· τοῦτο γάρ φησιν· "Τὸ γένος ἐν προσευχῇ ἐκτενεῖ, καὶ πίστει μετὰ νηστείας, ἐξέρχεται." Νηφόντως οὖν τὸν κάμνοντα ἐπισκεψώμεθα, ὡς ἐν πνεύματι ταπεινώσεως. Καλὸν οὖν τὸ συγκοπιᾶν τοῖς κάμνουσιν ἀδελφοῖς, ὡς εἴρηται, δι' ἀγρυπνιῶν, καὶ νηστειῶν, καὶ εὐχῶν ἀδιαλείπτων. Ἐρρέθη γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, "Δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλετε," μετὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἰάσεων· "Δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε, δωρεὰν δότε."

garrulitate et sine agendi ratione, quæ sit a pietate aliena et sine superbia, sed cum animo demisso et humili Christi. Itaque jejunio et oratione exorcizent illos, non vero verbis elegantibus sciteque compositis atque digestis, sed sicut homines, qui a Deo acceperunt charisma sanandi, *gratis accepistis, gratis date*, confidenter, ad laudem Dei. Jejuniis vestris et precationibus ac continuis vigiliis ceterisque bonis vestris operibus opera carnis mortificate per virtutem spiritus sancti. Qui sic agit, *templum is spiritus sancti Dei est;* hic dæmonia ejiciat, et adjuvabit illum Deus. Nam pulcrum est opitulari ægrotantibus. Præcepit Dominus: *Dæmonia ejicite*, aliasque multas sanationes facere jussit, et: *gratis accepistis, gratis date.*

Ep. i. 12 sq.

Etenim pulcrum hoc est coram Deo et coram hominibus, ut scilicet recordemur pauperum et ut fratres atque peregrinos diligamus propter Deum et propter eos, qui credunt in Deum, sicut EX LEGE AC PROPHETIS ET A DOMINO NOSTRO JESU CHRISTO didicimus de caritate erga fratres et peregrinos, propterea quod ipsum hoc jucundum est atque acceptum vobis; propterea quod *omnes* vos *edocti estis a Deo.* Nostis enim ea quæ dicta sunt verba de caritate erga fratres et peregrinos; potenter namque dicta sunt verba illa omnibus, qui ea faciunt. XIII. O fratres nostri dilecti. Etiam, quod quis ædificare debeat et confirmare fratres in fide unius Dei, manifestum est et notum.

Hom. 97. καλή ἐστιν ἡ φιλοξενία καὶ τῷ Θεῷ ἀρέσκουσα, μάλιστα δὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως. *Hom.* 98. Ἡ φιλοπτωχία καὶ ἡ φιλοξενία δύο κλάδοι εἰσὶν . . . "Προνοοῦ καλὰ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων." *Hom.* 96. Ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν πλησίον, μακράν ἐστιν ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας. Πᾶσα γὰρ Γραφὴ παλαιά τε καὶ νέα τοῦτο ἡμῖν παρακελεύεται, τὸ "Ἀγαπᾶν τὸν πλησίον ὡς ἑαυτόν." Δευτέραν γὰρ αὐτὴν μετὰ τὴν πρὸς Θεὸν ἀγάπην ὁ κύριος ἐντολὴν ἀπέδειξεν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου εἶναι . . . καὶ ὁ Πέτρος· "Ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ τηρήσωμεν, προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κ. ἡ. Ἰ. Χ." . . . "Ὁ δὲ κύριος πλεονάσαι καὶ περισσεύσαι ἡμᾶς τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ εἰς ἀλλήλους, καὶ εἰς πάντας." Φησὶν δὲ καὶ ἄλλοις, "Περὶ δὲ τῆς φιλαδελφίας αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς θεοδίδακτοί ἐστε εἰς τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους." καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἀγαπήσωμεν τοὺς ὁμοπίστους ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.

Vid. sup. p. 70.

Ep. i. 13.

Quod *messis multa sit, operarii autem pauci*, etiam hoc notum est atque manifestum. Itaque *precemur Dominum messis, ut emittat operarios in messem suam*, operarios tales, qui *recte tractent verbum veritatis, operarios inconfusibiles*, operarios fideles; operarios, qui *sint lux mundi*, operarios, qui *operentur non hunc cibum, qui*

Ὅτι δέ, "ὁ θερισμὸς πολύς, καὶ οἱ ἐργάται ὀλίγοι," δῆλον ὅτι ἐν τοῖς καιροῖς ἡμῶν λιμός[1] ἐστιν τοῦ ἀκοῦσαι λόγον κυρίου. διὸ δεηθῶμεν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ, ὅπως ἐκβάλλῃ ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ· ἀλλ' ἐργάτας τοιούτους, ὀρθοτομοῦντας τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀνεπαισχύντους, ἀνεπιλήπτους, ἐργάτας πιστούς, φωστῆ-

,, p. 72.

periturus sit, verum cibum illum, qui permaneat in vitam æternam; operarios tales, quales apostoli; operarios qui imitentur patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum, de hominum salute sollicitos; non operarios, (nine times more).

ρας οἰκουμένης, ἐργαζομένους μὴ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην, ἀλλὰ τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον· ἐργάτας τοιούτους, ὡς οἱ ἀπόστολοι, καὶ ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς, οἷς ἔλεγεν ὁ Παῦλος· "Οὐ τὸ ἔργον μου ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἐν κυρίῳ;" Συνεργοὺς τῷ[2] κυρίῳ εἰς τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, ἐργαζομένους τὴν σωτηρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων· "Οὐ γὰρ θέλει ὁ Θεὸς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἁμαρτωλοῦ, ὡς τὸ ἐπιστρέψαι, καὶ ζῆν αὐτόν." · · · "Ἔστιν γὰρ τῆς ἱεραρχίας ἡ τελείωσις, τὸ κατ' οἰκείαν ἀναλογίαν ἐπὶ τὸ θεομίμητον ἀναχθῆναι, καὶ Θεοῦ συνεργὸν γενέσθαι, καὶ δεῖξαι τὴν θείαν ἐνέργειαν κατὰ τὸ δυνατὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ φαινομένην, καὶ φωτίζεσθαι, καὶ φωτίζειν, καὶ καθαίρεσθαι καὶ καθαίρειν, καὶ τελεῖσθαι τὰ θεῖα, καὶ τελεσιουργεῖν."—*Hom.* 122.

(For §§ 1, 6, and Jerome, *vid. sup.* pp. 12, 29 sq.)

Epistula Posterior Ejusdem Clementis (*consisting of Sixteen Sections*).

Vid. sup. p. 75. Post hæc preces fundimus et nobis damus osculum pacis, viri viris. Mulieres autem et virgines manus suas vestimentis suis involvere debent; atque ibi etiam nos modeste et in omni verecundia, oculis in altum sublatis, verecunde et cum omni decentia dexteram manum vestimentis nostris involvimus; et tunc accedere possunt et dare nobis osculum pacis in dexteram nostram vestimentis nostris involutam. Post quæ imus illuc, quo Deus nobis ire concessit.—*Ep.* ii. 2.

Χρὴ οὖν πάσῃ φυλακῇ τηρεῖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ καρδίαν, καὶ μηδ' ὅλως συνδυάζειν παρθένον μετὰ νεανίσκου τὸ παράπαν· εἰ δὲ καὶ εὑρεθῶσιν πρεσβύτιδες ἱεροπρεπεῖς, εἰλῆσαι τὰς ἑαυτῶν χεῖρας τῷ ἑαυτῶν ἱματίῳ. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες μετὰ αἰδοῦς ὀρθῶς βλέποντες σωφρόνως τε καὶ σεμνῶς ἐν κυρίῳ, τὰς ἑαυτῶν δεξίας περικεκαλυμμένας ἔχοντες τῷ ἑαυτῶν ἱματίῳ, ἀποχωρισθῶσιν.—*Hom.* 21.

„ p. 86. III. Quod si incidimus in aliquem locum, ubi nullus sit frater sacratus, sed omnes sint conjuncti, omnes, qui ibi sunt, fratrem ad eos venientem suscipere debent et ministrare illi curamque de illo habere in omnibus, studiose, cum propensa voluntate. Igitur frater ille, ut oportet, ministrandus est ab illis, sicuti convenit; debet autem ille frater junctis, qui sunt in eo loco, dicere: Nos Deo sacri cum mulieribus neque manducamus neque bibimus, neque inserviunt nobis mulieres aut virgines, nec lavant nobis pedes mulieres neque ungunt nos, nec sternunt nobis mulieres, nec somnum capimus ibi, ubi dormiunt mulieres, ut irreprehensibiles simus in omnibus, ut nemo

Ὅλως γὰρ ἀναρμόδιόν ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀσκῆσαι βουλομένῳ, μετὰ γυναικὸς ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν, ἢ ὑπὸ γυναικὸς ὑπηρετεῖσθαι, ἢ προνοεῖν γυναικῶν, ἢ ὅλως μετ' αὐτῶν ἔχειν γνῶσιν. Ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κανο-

offendatur aut scandalizetur in nobis; et quando omnia hæc agimus, *nemini sumus offendiculo.* Sicut homines ergo, *qui cognoscimus timorem Domini, hominibus suademus, Deo autem manifesti sumus.*

νικαῖς ἀνάρμοστόν ἐστι συνδυάζειν μετὰ ἀνδρῶν, πρὸς τὸ μηδένα σκανδαλίζεσθαι δι' ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ὦμεν πᾶσιν ἀπρόσκοποι. "Εἰδότες γάρ, φησίν, τὸν φόβον τοῦ κυρίου, ἀνθρώπους πείθομεν, Θεῷ δὲ φανερούμεθα."—*Hom.* 18.

Φοβηθῶμεν τοίνυν, ὡς εἴρηται, Quod si incurramus aliquo, ubi inveniamus mulierem Christianam unam solam, nec quisquam alius ibi adsit nisi sola hæc, non subsistimus in eo loco neque precationes ibi peragimus neque Scripturas ibi legimus, sed *aufugimus inde veluti a conspectu serpentis aut sicut a conspectu peccati.* Non autem, quod Christianam hanc mulierem spernamus —absit a nobis, ut tali animo affecti simus erga fratres nostros in Christo—sed quia sola est, ideo timemus, etc.—*Ep.* ii. 5.

τοῦ σκανδαλίσαι τινάς, ἀκούοντες τοῦ κυρίου λέγοντος, ὅτι "συμφέρει, ἵνα λίθος μυλικὸς κρεμασθῇ περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ῥιφθῇ εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων" (S. Matt. xviii. 6). Χρὴ οὖν ὡς "ἀπὸ προσώπου ὄφεως καὶ ἁμαρτίας μεγάλης φεύγειν" ἀπ' αὐτῶν, διὰ τὸ θανατηφόρον εἶναι τοῖς βουλομένοις ἀσκεῖν, οὐ μόνον τὴν αὐτῶν ὁμιλίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἐνθύμησιν. He then quotes Prov. xxxi. 3, and then Ecclus. ix. 4 μετὰ ψαλλούσης μὴ ἐνδελέχιζε κ.τ.λ.—*Hom.* 18. *Vid. sup.* p. 87.

Ep. ii. 6.

Si vero contingat ut eamus in locum, ubi non sint Christiani, et necessarium nobis sit ibidem per aliquot dies consistere, *sapientes simus sicut serpentes et simplices sicut columbæ;* et ne simus *quasi insipientes, sed ut sapientes* in omni disciplina pietatis, ut Deus per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum omni in re glorificetur per vitæ nostræ rationem castam sanctamque. *Sive manducamus . . . ad Dei gloriam faciamus. Omnes, qui vident nos, semen benedictum* sanctumque *nos esse* et *filios Dei vivi* . . . in exemplum scilicet tam eorum, qui crediderunt, quam et illorum, qui deinceps credituri sunt. Ex Christi grege simus omnimoda justitia moribusque sanctissimis integerrimis, conversantes in rectitudine et sanctitate,

Hom. 112.

οἱ γὰρ σαρκικοὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ πράσσειν οὐ δύνανται, οὐδὲ οἱ πνευματικοὶ τὰ σαρκικά (*Ephes.* 8). Χρὴ οὖν τὸν βουλόμενον τὴν ἀγγελικὴν ταύτην τοῦ μονήρους βίου ἀσκῆσαι πολιτείαν, κτήσασθαι τὴν φρόνησιν τοῦ ὄφεως, καὶ τὸ ἀκέραιον τῆς περιστερᾶς, ἵνα συνιῇ ἐν παντί, τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ εὐάρεστον, καὶ τέλειον· ἵνα δοξάσθῃ ὁ Θεὸς ἐν πᾶσιν, διὰ τῆς θεοσεβοῦς ἡμῶν τάξεως, καὶ εἰλικρινοῦς πολιτείας· ἵνα οἱ ὁρῶντες ἡμᾶς ἐπιγνῶσιν, ὅτι σπέρμα εὐλογημένον ἅγιόν ἐσμεν, υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος κ.τ.λ.—*Hom.* 111. οὕτω τοίνον καὶ ἡγούμενος τύπος γινέσθω τοῦ ποιμνίου ἐν πάσῃ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἀναστροφῇ ἁγίᾳ· ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως πολιτευόμενος, τηρῶν ὅσα ἐστὶν ἁγνά, ὅσα σεμνά, εἴ τις ἀρετή, καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος, εἴ τις εὐφη- „ p. 90.

ut decet fideles, et sectantes ea, quæ laudibilia sunt et quæ pudica et sancta et quæ gloriosa et honorifica; et quæcumque usui sunt, hæc instituite.

μος. ὠφελείας διόρθωσις γινέσθω παρ' αὐτοῦ, "ἐκδικεῖν . . . ὅπου γὰρ πλείων κόπος, πολὺ καὶ τὸ κέρδος. . . . ἔστω φρόνιμος ἐν πᾶσιν ὡς οἱ ὄφεις, καὶ ἀκέραιος ὡς αἱ περιστεραί. κ.τ.λ." (Ignat. *Polyc.* §§ 1, 2.)

Vid. sup. p. 39.

VII. Consideremus nunc, fratres, et videamus, quomodo gesserint sese omnes patres justi toto tempore incolatus vitæ suæ; investigemus atque inquiramus inde a lege usque ad novum testamentum. Pulcrum quoque est atque utile, ut sciamus, quam multi viri et quinam perierint per mulieres, item quam multæ feminæ et quænam perierint per viros, ex adsiduitate, qua adsidui erant apud invicem. Porro etiam hoc indicabo, scilicet quam multi et quinam viri cum viris commorati sint toto vitæ suæ tempore et ad finem usque una permanserint in operationibus castis, immaculati.

Ἀκούσωμεν οὖν τί περὶ αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ θεία Γραφὴ διαγορεύει. , . .

VIII. Atque hoc ita esse manifestum notumque est. Ad Joseph quod attinet fidelem, prudentem, sapientem, justum, usquequaque timoratum, nonne casti sanctique illius pulcritudinem mulier libidinose concupivit? Cumque ille libidinosam ejus voluntatem perficere recusaret, hæc falso testimonio virum justum illum in summam afflictionem et miseriam projecit, immo et in vitæ discrimen. Deus autem eripuit eum ex omnibus malis, quæ per infelicem illam mulierem illi supervenerant. Videtis, fratres, quantas ærumnas justo huic viro attulerit continuus aspectus corporis Ægyptiacæ. Itaque ne assidui simus cum mulieribus aut cum adulescentulis. Hoc enim nequaquam prodest illis, qui *lumbos suos* volunt *succingere* veraciter. Sorores diligamus oportet in omni castitate et pudicitia et cum omni mentis continentia, in timore Dei, non assiduo cum illis commorantes nec quovis momento ad illas ingredientes.

πῶς δὲ καὶ ἡ Αἰγυπτία; ἢ τὴν μορφὴν τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ ἐπεπόθησε σαρκὸς πόθῳ, τοῦ ὄντος σεμνοτά του· καὶ τούτου μὴ ἐπινεύσαντος, εἰς θλίψεις καὶ στενοχωρίας διὰ τῆς ψευδηγορίας τὸν εὐσεβῆ περιέπειρεν ἕως θανάτου. Ὁρᾷς, ὅτι ὁ ἐντελεχισμὸς σαρκὸς τῆς Αἰγυπτίας πόσην κατειργάσατο τοῦ δικαίου θλῖψιν; Διὰ τοῦτο οὖν πᾶσι τρόποις συμφέρον ἡμῖν ἐστιν ἀπέχεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν. Οὐ γὰρ ἔχουσι λυσιτέλειαν αἱ αὐτῶν συντυχίαι τοῖς θέλουσιν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τὴν ὀσφὺν περιζώσασθαι.

IX. Nonne audivisti de Samson Naziræo, *quocum erat spiritus Dei*, de viro illo robusto? Atqui virum illum, qui Naziræus erat et Deo sacratus, fortis atque robustus, hunc mulier perdidit infelici suo corpore et prava libidine. Tune forte talis es, qualis erat ille? Nosce te ipsum et nosce modum tuum. *Mulier maritata animas pretiosas prædatur.* Quapropter nemini prorsus permittimus,

Οὐκ ἤκουσας περὶ τοῦ Σαμψὼν Ναζωραίου, μεθ' οὗ τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ κυρίου ἐπορεύετο; καὶ τὸν τοιοῦτον ἅγιον ἡ γυνὴ ἀπώλεσε διὰ τῆς μοχθηρᾶς σαρκός, καὶ ἀθεμίτων ἐπιθυμίας. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐδ' ὅλως ἐπιτρεπόμεθα, μετὰ γυναικὸς καθίσαι, ἢ ἔχειν συντυχίας, τὸ σύνολον.

ut commoretur apud maritatam, multi minus, ut quis cum sacrata Deo virgine cohabitet aut dormiat, ubi assiduus sit cum illa. Hoc enim aversandum et detestandum est ab iis, qui Deum timent.

X. Nonne erudit te id, quod accidit David, quem Deus *invenerat virum secundum cor suum*, hominem fidelem, perfectum, sanctum, firmum. Pulcritudinem inspectavit hic mulieris cujuspiam, Bethsabæ dico, cum videret eam mundantem sese et lavantem nudam. Vidit hanc mulierem vir sanctus, et reapse captus est per voluptatem ex ejus conspectu. Animadvertite nunc, quanta mala fecerit illius mulieris causa: et peccavit justus ille vir et mandatum dedit, ut maritus illius interficeretur in prælio. Vidistis, quot dolos malos struxerit et adhibuerit; et cupidine istius mulieris homicidium patravit David, qui *unctus Domini* vocatus est. Admonitus esto, o homo. Nam si tales tantique viri per mulieres perierunt, quænam tandem tua virtus est aut quisnam tu inter sanctos, ut cum mulieribus aut cum adulescentulis converseris diu noctuque, cum multa joculatione, absque timore Dei. Non ita, fratres, non ita agamus secundum lapsum illorum, verum memores simus effati illius de muliere, quo dictum est: *Manus ejus laqueos tendunt et cor ejus retia pandit; justus evadet ab illa, improbus autem in manus ejus cadet.* Itaque nos sancti devitemus cohabitare cum feminis Deo sacratis. Neque enim decora est hujusmodi agendi ratio nec convenit servis Dei.

Ὁμοίως καὶ περὶ τοῦ Δαυὶδ οὐ πεπαίδευσαι, ὃν καὶ εὗρεν ὁ Θεὸς ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ; Πῶς μορφῇ γυναικός, λέγω δὲ τῆς Βερσαβεέ, ἐπιθυμήσας, πόσοις κακοῖς περιέπεσε; ταύτην γὰρ ἰδὼν ὁ ἅγιος ἀληθῶς λουομένην, ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ τῆς μορφῆς αὐτῆς γενόμενος, πόσην κακίαν ὁ παμμέγιστος ἀνὴρ κατειργάσατο; καὶ ἥμαρτεν εἰς Θεὸν οὐ μόνον τῇ μοιχίᾳ περιπεσών, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς ἀναιρεθῆναι κελεύσας· ὁρᾷς πόσην δραματουργίαν κακίας ἐτελεσιούργησε διὰ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ὁ χριστὸς κυρίου Δαυίδ; παιδευθῶμεν τοῦ μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν. Εἰ γὰρ τηλικοῦτοι ἄνδρες διὰ γυναικῶν ἑάλωσαν, πῶς ἡμεῖς οἱ ἀνίσχυες μετὰ τῆς ἑαυτῶν πτώσεως διαπορευόμενοι, καὶ ἐν μέσῳ παγίδος διαβαίνοντες ἐκφευξώμεθα;

XI. Nonne legisti de Amnon et Thamar, liberis David? Amnon iste sororem suam appetebat eamque oppressit nec eidem pepercit, propterea quod turpi libidine eam concupivisset. Et improbus scelestusque evasit ob assiduam ejus cum illa conversationem, quæ non erat in timore Dei; et *fœdam rem operatus est in Israel.* Quapropter non convenit nobis nec decet nos conversari cum sororibus inter risus et petulantiam, sed cum omni verecundia ac castitate et in timore Dei.

Ὁμοίως καὶ Ἀμμὼν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτοῦ Θάμαρ ἀνῃρέθη καλῶς. (? κακῶς.)

XII. Nonne legisti de rebus gestis Salomon, filii David, cui Deus dederat sapientiam et scientiam et amplitudinem animi et divitias et gloriam majora quam omnibus hominibus. Atqui etiam ipse ille per mulieres periit et a Domino recessit.

Ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ Σολομὼν ἔχων σοφίαν καὶ φρόνησιν, καὶ χύμα καρδίας, καὶ πλοῦτον, καὶ δόξαν πολλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντας, καὶ οὗτος διὰ γυναικὸς ἀπώλετο, καὶ ἀποστάτης ἐγένετο διὰ γυναῖκας.

XIII. Nonne legisti et nosti de senioribus illis in diebus Susannæ, qui propterea, quod assidui erant cum mulieribus et alienam inspectabant pulcritudinem, in barathrum ceciderunt concupiscentiæ; nec potuerunt in casta mente retinere sese, verum superati sunt a pravo suo animo, et adorti sunt beatam Susannam, ut eam vitiarent. Illa autem minime obtemperavit turpi istorum libidini, sed Deum invocavit, et eripuit eam Deus de manibus iniquorum senum istorum. Nonne igitur commoveri nos oportet et timere ob hoc, quod senes illi, judices et seniores populi Dei, honore suo exciderint propter mulierem? Scilicet recordati non sunt illius, quo dictum est: *Alienam pulcritudinem ne inspectes;* aut illius: *Pulcritudo mulieris multos perdidit;* aut hujus: *Cum muliere maritata ne sedeas;* aut rursus illius, quod dixit: *Num est aliquis, qui ignem ponat in sinum suum et vestimenta sua non comburat?* aut hujus: *Num incedat aliquis super ignem, quin pedes ejus adurantur? Sic nemo, qui ad maritatam ingreditur, culpa vacabit nemoque evadet, qui ad illam appropinquat.* Et rursus dixit: *Pulcritudinem mulieris noli concupiscere, ut ne captivet te palpebris suis;* et alibi: *Adulescentulam ne inspectes, ut ne pereas illius desiderio;* et: *Cum muliere, quæ pulcre canit, noli esse assiduus;* et: *Qui stare sese existimat, videat, ne cadat.*

Καὶ οἱ *πρεσβύτεροι οἱ κατὰ Σουσάνναν κριταὶ διὰ τὸ ἐνδελεχίζειν καὶ καταμανθάνειν κάλλος ἀλλότριον, εἰς τὸ πέλαγος τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἐμπέσοντες, ἐπανέστησαν τῇ μακαρίᾳ Σουσάννῃ.—Hom.* 17.

(For §§ 7–13, 14, 15, and Jerome, *vid. sup.* pp. 32 sq., 33 note 1, 31.)

The above quotations from, and references to, the *Homilies* supply the more considerable points of contact between Antiochus Palæstinensis and the Epistles to Virgins.

C.

Another example is here given of the neglect of critics to avail themselves of evidence that could be found without the least difficulty. From the critical remarks of Jacobson, Lightfoot, Gebhardt and Harnack, Hilgenfeld, Simcox and others two notes are selected.

Οὕτως γὰρ εἶπεν· "Ἐλεᾶτε ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε, ἀφίετε ἵνα ἀφεθῇ ὑμῖν· ὡς ποιεῖτε, οὕτω ποιηθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς δίδοτε, οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς κρίνετε, οὕτως κριθήσεσθε ὑμῖν· ὡς χρηστεύεσθε, οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν· ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἐν αὐτῷ μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν."—Clement of Rome, *Ep.* i. 13.

"Ἐλεᾶτε," φησὶν ὁ κύριος, "ἵνα ἐλεηθῆτε· ἀφίετε, ἵνα ἀφεθῇ ὑμῖν· ὡς ποιεῖτε, οὕτως ποιηθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς δίδοτε, οὕτως δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· ὡς κρίνετε, οὕτως κριθήσεσθε· ὡς χρηστεύεσθε, οὕτως χρηστευθήσεται ὑμῖν· ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν." — Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* ii. 18, p. 476 (Potter).

"*Evang. sec. Matth.* vii. 2, p. 476." Potter's *Index*, p. 1068.

Dr. Lightfoot's note: "The same saying which is recorded in Matt. vii. 1, 2, Luke vi. 36–38, to which should be added Matt. v. 7 *μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται*, vi. 14 *ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφῆτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κ.τ.λ.*, Luke vi. 31 *καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν κ.τ.λ.* As Clement's quotations are often very loose, we need not go beyond the canonical Gospels for the source of this passage. The resemblance to the original is much closer here, than it is for instance in his account of Rahab above § 12. The hypothesis therefore that Clement derived the saying from oral tradition or from some lost Gospel is not needed." p. 67.

Potter's note: "Hæc præcepta, quoad sensum, occurrunt Matth. v. vi. vii., Luc. vi." On another quotation, which follows almost immediately, Potter says "Hæc è variis Scripturæ locis concinnavit Auctor: ut Prov. xix. 11; . . . xiv. 23 . . . xvii. 12." Similar fusions of text are very frequent in Clem. Alex.

Since 1633 critics have been professing to compare the writings of the two Clements.

MORRISON AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

WORK BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

Peregrinus Proteus: An Investigation into certain Relations subsisting between *De Morte Peregrini, The Two Epistles of Clement to the Corinthians, The Epistle to Diognetus, The Bibliotheca of Photius,* and other Writings. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Athenæum.

There are many other curious phenomena of a like nature which Mr. Cotterill has brought to light, and he deserves the greatest praise for the diligence, honesty and thorough scholarship with which he has investigated the subject. Perhaps it is premature to pronounce an opinion as to the conclusion to which they point. . . . But whatever may be the inferences that are to be drawn, Mr. Cotterill's work deserves to be studied earnestly, and the problems which he presents for solution are at once exceedingly interesting and exceedingly important.

The Literary Churchman.

That he has made out a strong case against many of the impugned writings . . . we willingly allow; that the question of the genuineness of S. Clement's Epistles is herein decided in the negative, we cannot conclude. Competent scholars will, we trust, pursue the examination which Mr. Cotterill has begun with such skill and perseverance.

Scotsman.

It must be sufficient to say in general that a pretty strong case is made out against all the writings assailed. . . . And if he does not conclusively establish his theory, he has at least enough to say in its defence to make his book well worthy of the attention of all interested in the writings whose character he discusses.

Tablet.

We shall only say that Mr. Cotterill shows immense learning, and writes in a style remarkably lucid. His volume will be of great value to all students of ecclesiastical history and of the reprints and republications in general of the Renaissance.

The Presbyterian, Philadelphia and New York.

Mr. Cotterill has a fixed conviction that a great literary fraud was practised at the time of the revival of learning, and that all the patristic books named above are spurious. He believes that Henry Stephens, who belonged to the celebrated family of printers in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, was at least accessory after the fact, but that other persons were the principals. He examines the Epistles with great minuteness, and with great ingenuity in the comparison of their weak and halting parts, and certainly brings out facts which abundantly favour his theory. It is a learned book, such as was wont to be seen two centuries ago.

Preparing for Publication.

MODERN CRITICISM AND THE EPISTLE TO DIOGNETUS

AND

MODERN CRITICISM AND CLEMENT'S EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.

PUBLICATIONS OF

T. AND T. CLARK,

38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH.

Adam (J., D.D.)—AN EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE OF JAMES. 8vo, 9s.

Alexander (Dr. J. A.)—COMMENTARY ON THE PROPHECIES OF ISAIAH. New and Revised Edition. Two vols. 8vo, 17s.

Ante-Nicene Christian Library—A COLLECTION OF ALL THE WORKS OF THE FATHERS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH PRIOR TO THE COUNCIL OF NICÆA. Twenty-four vols. 8vo, Subscription price, £6, 6s.

Auberlen (C. A.)—THE DIVINE REVELATION. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Augustine's Works—Edited by MARCUS DODS, D.D. Fifteen vols. 8vo, Subscription price, £3, 19s.

Bannerman (Professor)—THE CHURCH OF CHRIST: A Treatise on the Nature, Powers, Ordinances, Discipline, and Government of the Christian Church. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Baumgarten (Professor)—APOSTOLIC HISTORY; Being an Account of the Development of the Early Church in the form of a Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. Three vols. 8vo, 27s.

Beck (Dr.)—OUTLINES OF BIBLICAL PSYCHOLOGY. Crown 8vo, 4s.

——— PASTORAL THEOLOGY. *Shortly.*

Bengel—GNOMON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. With Original Notes, Explanatory and Illustrative. Five vols. 8vo, Subscription price, 31s. 6d. *Cheaper Edition, the five volumes bound in three,* 24s.

Besser (Dr. Rudolph)—BIBLICAL STUDIES ON ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. Two vols. crown 8vo, 12s.

Binnie (Wm., D.D.)—THE CHURCH. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Bleek (Professor)—AN INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Bowman (T., M.A.)—EASY AND COMPLETE HEBREW COURSE: Containing Hebrew Grammar, Exercises, and Lexicon. 8vo. Part I., 7s. 6d.; Part II., 10s. 6d.

Briggs (Prof. C.A., D.D.)—BIBLICAL STUDY: Its Principles, Methods, and History. With a Preface by Rev. Prof. BRUCE, D.D., Glasgow. Post 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Brown (David, D.D.)—CHRIST'S SECOND COMING: Will it be Pre-Millennial? Seventh Edition, crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

——— THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Price 2s.

Bruce (A. B., D.D.)—THE TRAINING OF THE TWELVE; or, Exposition of Passages in the Gospels exhibiting the Twelve Disciples of Jesus under Discipline for the Apostleship. Third Edition, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— THE HUMILIATION OF CHRIST, in its Physical, Ethical, and Official Aspects. Second Edition, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Buchanan (Professor)—THE DOCTRINE OF JUSTIFICATION: An Outline of its History in the Church, and of its Exposition from Scripture, with special reference to recent attacks on the Theology of the Reformation. (Second Series of Cunningham Lectures.) 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— ON COMFORT IN AFFLICTION. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

——— ON IMPROVEMENT OF AFFLICTION. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Bungener (Felix)—Rome and the Council in the Nineteenth Century. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Calvin—His Life, Labours, and Writings. By Felix Bungener. 8vo, 8s. 6d.

——— Institutes of the Christian Religion. Translated by Henry Beveridge. Two vols. 8vo, 14s.

Calvini Institutio Christianæ Religionis. Curavit A. Tholuck. Two vols. 8vo, Subscription price, 14s.

Candlish (Rev. Professor)—The Christian Sacraments. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Caspari (C. E.)—A Chronological and Geographical Introduction to the Life of Christ. 8vo, 9s.

Caspers (A.)—The Footsteps of Christ. Crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Cave (Professor)—The Scriptural Doctrine of Sacrifice. Demy 8vo, 12s.

Christlieb (Dr.)—Modern Doubt and Christian Belief. A Series of Apologetic Lectures addressed to Earnest Seekers after Truth. Fourth Edition, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Cotterill (J. M.)—Peregrinus Proteus: An Investigation into certain Relations between De Morte Peregrini, the Two Epistles of Clement to the Corinthians, etc. 8vo, 12s.

Cousin (Victor)—Lectures on the True, the Beautiful, and the Good. Post 8vo, 6s. 6d.

Cremer (Professor)—Biblico-Theological Lexicon of New Testament Greek. Third Edition, demy 4to, 25s.

Crippen (Rev. T. G.)—A Popular Introduction to the History of Christian Doctrine. 8vo, 9s.

Cunningham (Principal)—Historical Theology. A Review of the Principal Doctrinal Discussions in the Christian Church since the Apostolic Age. Second Edition, Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— Reformers and Theology of the Reformation. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Discussions on Church Principles. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Curtiss (Dr. S. I.)—The Levitical Priests. A Contribution to the Criticism of the Pentateuch. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Dabney (R. L., D.D.)—The Sensualistic Philosophy of the Nineteenth Century Considered. Crown 8vo, 6s.

——— Lectures on Systematic and Polemic Theology. Second Edition, imperial 8vo, 16s.

Davidson (Professor)—An Introductory Hebrew Grammar. With Progressive Exercises in Reading and Writing. Sixth Edition, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

——— The Epistle to the Hebrews. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Delitzsch (Professor)—A System of Biblical Psychology. Second Edition, 8vo, 12s.

——— Commentary on Job. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— Commentary on Psalms. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

——— On the Proverbs of Solomon. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— On the Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Old Testament History of Redemption. Lectures Translated from the MS. by Professor S. I. Curtiss. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.

Delitzsch (Prof.)—Commentary on Isaiah. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— On the Epistle to the Hebrews. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Dods (Marcus, D.D.)—The Post-Exilian Prophets—Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. With Introduction and Notes. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Crown 8vo, 2s.

——— The Book of Genesis. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Cr. 8vo, 2s.

Doedes (Dr. J.)—Manual of Hermeneutics for the New Testament. Crown 8vo, 3s.

Döllinger (Dr.)—Hippolytus and Callistus; or, The Roman Church in the First Half of the Third Century. 8vo, 9s.

Dorner (Professor)—History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ. Five vols. 8vo, £2, 12s. 6d.

——— System of Christian Doctrine. Four vols. 8vo, £2, 2s.

——— History of Protestant Theology, particularly in Germany, viewed according to its Fundamental Movement, and in connection with the Religious, Moral, and Intellectual Life. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Douglas (Principal)—The Book of Judges. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Crown 8vo, 1s. 3d.

——— The Book of Joshua. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Cr. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Eadie (Professor)—Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians. New and Revised Editions, Edited by Rev. William Young, M.A. Four vols. 8vo, 10s. 6d. each.

Ebrard (Dr. J. H. A.)—The Gospel History: A Compendium of Critical Investigations in support of the Four Gospels. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Commentary on the Epistles of St. John. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Elliott (Chas., D.D.)—A Treatise on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. 8vo, 6s.

Ernesti—Principles of Biblical Interpretation of New Testament. Two vols. fcap. 8vo, 8s.

Ewald (Heinrich)—Syntax of the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament. 8vo, 8s. 6d.

Fairbairn (Principal)—Typology of Scripture, viewed in connection with the series of Divine Dispensations. Sixth Edition, Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— The Revelation of Law in Scripture, considered with respect both to its own Nature and to its relative place in Successive Dispensations. (The Third Series of Cunningham Lectures.) 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Ezekiel and the Book of his Prophecy: An Exposition. Fourth Edition, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Prophecy Viewed in its Distinctive Nature, its Special Functions, and Proper Interpretations. Second Edition, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— New Testament Hermeneutical Manual. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— The Pastoral Epistles. The Greek Text and Translation. With Introduction, Expository Notes, and Dissertations. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

——— Pastoral Theology: A Treatise on the Office and Duties of the Christian Pastor. With a Memoir of the Author. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Fisher (G. B., D.D.)—The Beginnings of Christianity, with a View of the State of the Roman World at the Birth of Christ. 8vo, 12s.

Forbes (Professor)—THE SYMMETRICAL STRUCTURE OF SCRIPTURE; or, Scripture Parallelism Exemplified. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

——— ANALYTICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS, tracing the Train of Thought by the aid of Parallelism. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Gebhardt (H.)—THE DOCTRINE OF THE APOCALYPSE, AND ITS RELATION TO THE DOCTRINE OF THE GOSPEL AND EPISTLES OF JOHN. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Gerlach—COMMENTARY ON THE PENTATEUCH. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Gieseler (Dr. J. C. L.)—A COMPENDIUM OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY. Five vols. 8vo, £2, 12s. 6d.

Gifford (Canon)—VOICES OF THE PROPHETS: Twelve Lectures preached on the Foundation of Bishop Warburton. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Given (Rev. Prof. J. J.)—THE TRUTHS OF SCRIPTURE IN CONNECTION WITH REVELATION, INSPIRATION, AND THE CANON. 8vo, 9s.

Glasgow (Professor)—THE APOCALYPSE TRANSLATED AND EXPOUNDED. 8vo, 14s.

Gloag (Paton J., D.D.)—A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— THE MESSIANIC PROPHECIES. *The Baird Lecture*, 1879. In crown 8vo, price 7s. 6d.

——— INTRODUCTION TO THE PAULINE EPISTLES. 8vo, 12s.

Godet (Prof.)—COMMENTARY ON ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— COMMENTARY ON ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

——— COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— LECTURES IN DEFENCE OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. Cr. 8vo, 6s.

Goebel (Siegfried)—THE PARABLES OF JESUS. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Gotthold's Emblems; or, INVISIBLE THINGS UNDERSTOOD BY THINGS THAT ARE MADE. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Hagenbach (Dr. K. R.)—HISTORY OF DOCTRINES. Translated from the last Edition, and edited, with large additions from various sources. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

——— HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY AND SWITZERLAND CHIEFLY. Translated from the Fourth Revised Edition of the German by EVELINA MOORE. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Hall (Rev. Newman, LL.B.)—THE LORD'S PRAYER: A Practical Meditation. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Harless (Dr. C. A.)—SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Harris (Rev. Samuel, D.D.)—THE PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF THEISM: An Examination of the Personality of Man to ascertain his Capacity to Know and Serve God, and the Validity of the Principles underlying the Defence of Theism. Ex. 8vo, 12s.

Haupt (Erich)—THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN. A Contribution to Biblical Theology. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Hävernick (H. A. Ch.)—INTRODUCTION TO OLD TESTAMENT. 10s. 6d.

Heard (Rev. J. B., M.A.)—THE TRIPARTITE NATURE OF MAN—SPIRIT, SOUL, AND BODY—applied to Illustrate and Explain the Doctrine of Original Sin, the New Birth, the Disembodied State, and the Spiritual Body. With an Appendix on the Fatherhood of God. Fifth Edition, crown 8vo, 6s.

Hefele (Bishop)—A HISTORY OF THE COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH. Vol. I., to A.D. 325; Vol. II., A.D. 326 to 429. Vol. III., A.D. 431 to the close of the Council of Chalcedon, 451. 8vo, 12s. each.

Hengstenberg (Professor)—COMMENTARY ON PSALMS. 3 vols. 8vo, 33s.

Hengstenberg (Professor)—COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES. To which are appended: Treatises on the Song of Solomon; on the Book of Job; on the Prophet Isaiah, etc. 8vo, 9s.

——— THE PROPHECIES OF THE PROPHET EZEKIEL ELUCIDATED. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— DISSERTATIONS ON THE GENUINENESS OF DANIEL, AND THE INTEGRITY OF ZECHARIAH. 8vo, 12s.

——— HISTORY OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— CHRISTOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT: A Commentary on the Messianic Predictions. Second Edition, Four vols. 8vo, £2, 2s.

——— ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Hermes Trismegistus—THEOLOGICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS. Translated from the original Greek by J. D. CHAMBERS, M.A. 8vo, 6s.

Herzog—ENCYCLOPÆDIA OR DICTIONARY OF BIBLICAL, HISTORICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND PRACTICAL THEOLOGY. *Based on the Real-Encyklopädie of Herzog, Plitt, and Hauck.* Edited by Professor SCHAFF, D.D. In Three vols., price 24s. each.

Hutchison (John, D.D.)—COMMENTARY ON THESSALONIANS. 8vo, 9s.

Janet (Paul)—FINAL CAUSES. By PAUL JANET, Member of the Institute. Translated from the French by W. AFFLECK, B.D. Second Edition. Demy 8vo, 12s.

——— THE THEORY OF MORALS. Translated from the latest French Edition. Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d. *Shortly.*

Jouffroy—PHILOSOPHICAL ESSAYS. Fcap. 8vo, 5s.

Kant—THE METAPHYSIC OF ETHICS. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Keil (Professor)—BIBLICAL COMMENTARY ON THE PENTATEUCH. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

——— COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF JOSHUA, JUDGES, AND RUTH. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF KINGS. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— COMMENTARY ON EZRA, NEHEMIAH, ESTHER. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— COMMENTARY ON JEREMIAH. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— COMMENTARY ON EZEKIEL. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— COMMENTARY ON DANIEL. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— ON THE BOOKS OF THE MINOR PROPHETS. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— MANUAL OF HISTORICO-CRITICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE CANONICAL SCRIPTURES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Keymer (Rev. N., M.A.)—NOTES ON GENESIS; or, Christ and His Church among the Patriarchs. With a Preliminary Notice by the Bishop of Lincoln. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Killen (Prof.)—THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH; or, The History, Doctrine, Worship, and Polity of the Christians, traced from the Apostolic Age to the Establishment of the Pope as a Temporal Sovereign, A.D. 755. 8vo, 9s.

Krummacher (Dr. F. W.)—THE SUFFERING SAVIOUR; or, Meditations on the Last Days of the Sufferings of Christ. Eighth Edit., crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

——— DAVID, THE KING OF ISRAEL: A Portrait drawn from Bible History and the Book of Psalms. Second Edition, crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Krummacher (Dr. F. W.)—AUTOBIOGRAPHY. Edited by his Daughter. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Kurtz (Prof.)—HANDBOOK OF CHURCH HISTORY. Two vols. 8vo, 15s.

——— HISTORY OF THE OLD COVENANT. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

Ladd (Prof. G. T.)—THE DOCTRINE OF SACRED SCRIPTURE: A Critical, Historical, and Dogmatic Inquiry into the Origin and Nature of the Old and New Testaments. Two vols., extra demy, 28s.

Laidlaw (Rev. Prof. John, D.D.)—THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF MAN. (The Seventh Series of Cunningham Lectures.) 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Lange (J. P., D.D.)—THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. Edited, with additional Notes, by MARCUS DODS, D.D. Second Edition, in Four vols. 8vo, Subscription price, 28s.

——— COMMENTARIES ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT. Edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. OLD TESTAMENT, 14 vols.; NEW TESTAMENT, 10 vols.; APOCRYPHA, 1 vol. Subscription price, nett, 15s. each.

Lange (J. P., D.D.)—COMMENTARY, THEOLOGICAL AND HOMILETICAL, ON THE GOSPELS OF ST. MATTHEW AND ST. MARK. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

——— ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE. Two vols. 8vo, 18s.

——— ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— ON THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Lewis (Tayler, LL.D.)—THE SIX DAYS OF CREATION. New Edition, crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Lindsay (Rev. Prof., D.D.)—THE REFORMATION. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Crown 8vo, 2s.

——— THE GOSPEL OF ST. MARK. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Cr. 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Lisco (F. G.)—PARABLES OF JESUS EXPLAINED. Fcap. 8vo, 5s.

Lötze (Professor)—MICROCOSMOS. *In preparation.*

Luthardt, Kahnis, and Brückner—THE CHURCH: Its Origin, its History, and its Present Position. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Luthardt (Prof.)—ST. JOHN THE AUTHOR OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL. 9s.

——— ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL DESCRIBED AND EXPLAINED ACCORDING TO ITS PECULIAR CHARACTER. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.

——— APOLOGETIC LECTURES ON THE FUNDAMENTAL (*Sixth Edition*), SAVING (*Fourth Edition*), MORAL TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY (*Third Edition*). Three vols. crown 8vo, 6s. each.

Macdonald (Rev. Donald)—INTRODUCTION TO THE PENTATEUCH: An Inquiry, Critical and Doctrinal, into the Genuineness, Authority, and Design of the Mosaic Writings. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— THE CREATION AND FALL. 8vo, 12s.

Macgregor (Rev. Jas., D.D.)—THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS. With Introduction and Notes. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Macpherson (Rev. John, M.A.)—THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION OF FAITH. With Introduction and Notes. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Cr. 8vo, 2s.

——— PRESBYTERIANISM. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

M'Lauchlan (T., D.D., LL.D.)—THE EARLY SCOTTISH CHURCH. To the Middle of the Twelfth Century. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Mair (Alexander, D.D.)—STUDIES IN THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Martensen (Bishop)—CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS: A Compendium of the Doctrines of Christianity. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (GENERAL ETHICS.) 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (INDIVIDUAL ETHICS.) 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (SOCIAL ETHICS.) 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Matheson (Geo., D.D.)—Growth of the Spirit of Christianity, from the First Century to the Dawn of the Lutheran Era. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— Aids to the Study of German Theology. 3d Edition, 4s. 6d.

Meyer (Dr.)—Critical and Exegetical Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— On Mark and Luke. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— On St. John's Gospel. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— On Acts of the Apostles. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— On the Epistle to the Romans. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— On Corinthians. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— On Galatians. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— On Ephesians and Philemon. One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— On Philippians and Colossians. One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— On Thessalonians. (*Dr. Lünemann.*) One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— The Pastoral Epistles. (*Dr. Huther.*) One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— The Epistle to the Hebrews. (*Dr. Lünemann.*) 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— On St. James' and St. John's Epistles. (*Dr. Huther.*) 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Peter and Jude. (*Dr. Huther.*) One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Monrad (Dr. D. G.)—The World of Prayer; or, Prayer in relation to Personal Religion. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.

Morgan (J., D.D.)—Scripture Testimony to the Holy Spirit. 9s.

——— Exposition of the First Epistle of John. 8vo, 9s.

Müller (Dr. Julius)—The Christian Doctrine of Sin. An entirely New Translation from the Fifth German Edition. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Murphy (Professor)—A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms. 8vo, 12s.

——— Books of Chronicles. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Cr. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

——— A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Exodus. 9s.

Naville (Ernest)—The Problem of Evil. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.

——— The Christ. Translated by Rev. T. J. Després. Cr. 8vo, 4s. 6d.

——— Modern Physics: Studies Historical and Philosophical. Translated by Rev. Henry Downton, M.A. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Nicoll (W. R., M.A.)—The Incarnate Saviour: A Life of Jesus Christ. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Neander (Dr.)—General History of the Christian Religion and Church. Nine vols. 8vo, £3, 7s. 6d.

Oehler (Prof.)—Theology of the Old Testament. 2 vols. 8vo, 21s.

Oosterzee (Dr. Van)—The Year of Salvation. Words of Life for Every Day. A Book of Household Devotion. Two vols. 8vo, 7s. 6d. each.

——— Moses: A Biblical Study. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Olshausen (Dr. H.)—Biblical Commentary on the Gospels and Acts. Four vols. 8vo, £2, 2s. *Cheaper Edition*, four vols. crown 8vo, 24s.

——— Romans. One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— Corinthians. One vol. 8vo, 9s.

——— Philippians, Titus, and First Timothy. One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Owen (Dr. John)—Works. *Best and only Complete Edition.* Edited by Rev. Dr. Goold. Twenty-four vols. 8vo, Subscription price, £4, 4s.

The '*Hebrews*' may be had separately, in Seven vols., £2, 2s. nett.

Philippi (F. A.)—Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. From the Third Improved Edition, by Rev. Professor Banks. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Piper (Dr. Ferdinand)—Lives of the Leaders of the Church Universal. Translated from the German, and edited, with additions, by H. M. Maccracken, D.D. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

Popular Commentary on the New Testament. Edited by Philip Schaff, D.D. With Illustrations and Maps. Vol. I.—The Synoptical Gospels. Vol. II.—St. John's Gospel, and the Acts of the Apostles. Vol. III.—Romans to Philemon. Vol. IV.—Hebrews to Revelation. In Four vols. imperial 8vo, 18s. each.

Pressensé (Edward de)—The Redeemer: Discourses Translated from the French. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Rainy (Principal)—Delivery and Development of Christian Doctrine. (The Fifth Series of the Cunningham Lectures.) 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Reusch (Professor)—Bible and Nature. *In preparation.*

Reuss (Professor)—History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament. *In preparation.*

Riehm (Dr. E.)—Messianic Prophecy: Its Origin, Historical Character, and Relation to New Testament Fulfilment. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Ritter (Carl)—The Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula. Four vols. 8vo, 32s.

Robinson (Rev. S., D.D.)—Discourses on Redemption. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Robinson (Edward, D.D.)—Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament. 8vo, 9s.

Rothe (Professor)—Sermons for the Christian Year. Cr. 8vo, 6s.

Saisset—Manual of Modern Pantheism: Essay on Religious Philosophy. Two vols. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Schaff (Professor)—History of the Christian Church. (New Edition, thoroughly Revised and Enlarged.)

——— Apostolic Christianity, A.D. 1–100. In Two Divisions. Ex. 8vo, 21s.

——— Ante-Nicene Christianity, A.D. 100–325. In Two Divisions. Ex. 8vo, 21s.

——— Post-Nicene Christianity, A.D. 325–600. In Two Divisions. Ex. 8vo, 21s.

Schmid's Biblical Theology of the New Testament. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Scott (Jas., M.A., D.D.)—Principles of New Testament Quotation Established and Applied to Biblical Criticism. Cr. 8vo, 2nd Edit., 4s.

Scrymgeour (Wm., M.A.)—Lessons on the Life of Christ. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Shedd (W., D.D.)—History of Christian Doctrine. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— Sermons to the Natural Man. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

Smeaton (Professor)—The Doctrine of the Atonement as Taught by Christ Himself. Second Edition, 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— On the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit. (*Ninth Series of Cunningham Lectures.*) 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Smith (H. B., D.D.)—Faith and Philosophy: Discourses and Essays. Edited, with an Introductory Notice, by G. L. Prentiss, D.D. 8vo, 12s.

Smith (Professor Thos., D.D.)—Mediæval Missions. (*Duff Missionary Lectures, First Series.*) Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.

Stalker (Jas., M.A.)—A Life of Christ. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Steinmeyer (Dr. F. L.)—The Miracles of Our Lord: Examined in their relation to Modern Criticism. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

——— The History of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord, considered in the Light of Modern Criticism. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Stevenson (Mrs.)—THE SYMBOLIC PARABLES: The Predictions of the Apocalypse viewed in relation to the General Truths of Scripture. Crown 8vo, 5s.

Steward (Rev. G.)—MEDIATORIAL SOVEREIGNTY: The Mystery of Christ and the Revelation of the Old and New Testaments. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— THE ARGUMENT OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. A Posthumous Work. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Stier (Dr. Rudolph)—ON THE WORDS OF THE LORD JESUS. Eight vols. 8vo, £4, 4s. Separate volumes may be had, price 10s. 6d.

In order to bring this valuable Work more within the reach of all Classes, both Clergy and Laity, Messrs. Clark continue to supply the Eight-volume Edition bound in FOUR *at the Original Subscription price of £2, 2s.*

——— THE WORDS OF THE RISEN SAVIOUR, AND COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

——— THE WORDS OF THE APOSTLES EXPOUNDED. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Tholuck (Professor)—COMMENTARY ON GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. 8vo, 9s.

——— THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. Two vols. fcap. 8vo, 8s.

——— LIGHT FROM THE CROSS: Sermons on the Passion of Our Lord. Third Edition, crown 8vo, 5s.

——— COMMENTARY ON THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Tophel (Pastor G.)—THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. Translated by Rev. T. J. DESPRÉS. Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Uhlhorn (G.)—CHRISTIAN CHARITY IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH. Crown 8vo, 6s.

Ullmann (Dr. Carl)—REFORMERS BEFORE THE REFORMATION, principally in Germany and the Netherlands. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— THE SINLESSNESS OF JESUS: An Evidence for Christianity. Fourth Edition, crown 8vo, 6s.

Urwick (W., M.A.)—THE SERVANT OF JEHOVAH: A Commentary upon Isaiah lii. 13-liii. 12; with Dissertations upon Isaiah xl.-lxvi. 8vo, 6s.

Vinet (Professor)—STUDIES ON BLAISE PASCAL. Crown 8vo, 5s.

——— PASTORAL THEOLOGY. Second Edition, post 8vo, 3s. 6d.

Walker (Rev. Norman L.)—SCOTTISH CHURCH HISTORY. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

Watts (Professor)—THE NEWER CRITICISM AND THE ANALOGY OF THE FAITH. A Reply to Lectures by W. Robertson Smith, M.A., on the Old Testament in the Jewish Church. Third Edition, crown 8vo, 5s.

Weiss (Prof. Bernhard)—BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.

——— LIFE OF CHRIST. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d. *Vol. III. in Press.*

White (Rev. M.)—THE SYMBOLICAL NUMBERS OF SCRIPTURE. Crown 8vo, 4s.

Whyte (Alexander, D.D.)—THE SHORTER CATECHISM. *Bible Class Handbooks.* Crown 8vo, 2s. 6d.

Williams (W. H., M.A.)—A SELECT VOCABULARY OF LATIN ETYMOLOGY. For the use of Schools. Fcap. 8vo, 1s. 6d.

——— OVID'S PONTIC EPISTLES. With Notes for Schools. *In the Press.*

Winer (Dr. G. B.)—A TREATISE ON THE GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK, regarded as the Basis of New Testament Exegesis. Third Edition, edited by W. F. MOULTON, D.D. Ninth English Edition, 8vo, 15s.

——— A COMPARATIVE VIEW OF THE DOCTRINES AND CONFESSIONS OF THE VARIOUS COMMUNITIES OF CHRISTENDOM. 8vo, 10s. 6d.

Wuttke (Professor)—CHRISTIAN ETHICS. Two vols. 8vo, 12s. 6d.

NEW SERIES

OF THE

FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

The First Issue for 1884 *will comprise—*

WEISS ON THE LIFE OF CHRIST. Vol. III. (completion).
SARTORIUS ON THE DOCTRINE OF DIVINE LOVE. One Vol.

1880.—GODET'S COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS. Vol. I.
HAGENBACH'S HISTORY OF DOCTRINES. Vols. I. and II.
DORNER'S SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. Vol. I.

1881.—GODET'S COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS. Vol. II.
DORNER'S SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. Vol. II.
MARTENSEN'S CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (Individual Ethics.)
HAGENBACH'S HISTORY OF DOCTRINES. Vol. III. (completion).

1882.—DORNER'S SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. Vols. III. and IV. (completion).
WEISS'S BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Vol. I.
MARTENSEN'S CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (Social Ethics.)

1883.—WEISS ON THE LIFE OF CHRIST. Vols. I. and II.
WEISS ON BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF NEW TESTAMENT. Vol. II. (completion).
GOEBEL ON THE PARABLES. One Vol.

The FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY was commenced in 1846, and from that time to this Four Volumes yearly (or about 160 in all) have appeared with the utmost regularity.

The Publishers decided to begin a NEW SERIES with 1880, and so give an opportunity to many to subscribe who are possibly deterred by the extent of the former Series.

The Publishers are sanguine enough to believe that a Series containing the works of writers so eminent, upon the most important subjects, cannot fail to secure support.

The Binding of the Series is modernized, so as to distinguish it from the former Series.

The Subscription Price will remain as formerly, 21s. annually for Four Volumes, payable in advance.

A SELECTION OF TWENTY VOLUMES FOR FIVE GUINEAS

(OR MORE AT SAME RATIO)

May be had from the Volumes issued previously to New Series, viz.:—
Works mentioned on three succeeding pages.

FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION: One Guinea for Four Volumes, Demy 8vo.

N.B.—Any *two* Years in this Series can be had at Subscription Price. *A single Year's Books* (except in the case of the current Year) *cannot be supplied separately.* Non-subscribers, price 10s. 6d. each volume, with exceptions marked.

1864—Lange on the Acts of the Apostles. Two Volumes.
Keil and Delitzsch on the Pentateuch. Vols. I. and II.

1865—Keil and Delitzsch on the Pentateuch. Vol. III.
Hengstenberg on the Gospel of John. Two Volumes.
Keil and Delitzsch on Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. One Volume.

1866—Keil and Delitzsch on Samuel. One Volume.
Keil and Delitzsch on Job. Two Volumes.
Martensen's System of Christian Doctrine. One Volume.

1867—Delitzsch on Isaiah. Two Volumes.
Delitzsch on Biblical Psychology. (12s.) One Volume.
Auberlen on Divine Revelation. One Volume.

1868—Keil's Commentary on the Minor Prophets. Two Volumes.
Delitzsch's Commentary on Epistle to the Hebrews. Vol. I.
Harless' System of Christian Ethics. One Volume.

1869—Hengstenberg on Ezekiel. One Volume.
Stier on the Words of the Apostles. One Volume.
Keil's Introduction to the Old Testament. Vol. I.
Bleek's Introduction to the New Testament. Vol. I.

1870—Keil's Introduction to the Old Testament. Vol. II.
Bleek's Introduction to the New Testament. Vol. II.
Schmid's New Testament Theology. One Volume.
Delitzsch's Commentary on Epistle to the Hebrews. Vol. II.

1871—Delitzsch's Commentary on the Psalms. Three Volumes.
Hengstenberg's Kingdom of God under the Old Testament. Vol. I.

1872—Keil's Commentary on the Books of Kings. One Volume.
Keil's Commentary on the Book of Daniel. One Volume.
Keil's Commentary on the Books of Chronicles. One Volume.
Hengstenberg's History of the Kingdom of God. Vol. II.

1873—Keil's Commentary on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. One Volume.
Winer's Collection of the Confessions of Christendom. One Volume.
Keil's Commentary on Jeremiah. Vol. I.
Martensen on Christian Ethics.

1874—Christlieb's Modern Doubt and Christian Belief. One Vol.
Keil's Commentary on Jeremiah. Vol. II.
Delitzsch's Commentary on Proverbs. Vol. I.
Oehler's Biblical Theology of the Old Testament. Vol. I.

1875—Godet's Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel. Two Volumes.
Oehler's Biblical Theology of the Old Testament. Vol. II.
Delitzsch's Commentary on Proverbs. Vol. II.

1876—Keil's Commentary on Ezekiel. Two Volumes.
Luthardt's Commentary on St. John's Gospel. Vol. I.
Godet's Commentary on St. John's Gospel. Vol. I.

1877—Delitzsch's Commentary on Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes.
Godet's Commentary on St. John's Gospel. Vols. II. and III.
Luthardt's Commentary on St. John's Gospel. Vol. II.

1878—Gebhardt's Doctrine of the Apocalypse.
Luthardt's Commentary on St. John's Gospel. Vol. III.
Philippi's Commentary on the Romans. Vol. I.
Hagenbach's History of the Reformation. Vol. I.

1879—Philippi's Commentary on the Romans. Vol. II.
Hagenbach's History of the Reformation. Vol. II.
Steinmeyer's History of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord.
Haupt's Commentary on the First Epistle of St. John. One Volume.

*** *For New Series commencing with* 1880, *see previous page.*

MESSRS. CLARK allow a SELECTION of TWENTY VOLUMES (*or more at the same ratio*) from the Volumes issued previously to New Series (*see below*),

At the Subscription Price of Five Guineas.

NON-SUBSCRIPTION PRICES WITHIN BRACKETS.

Dr. Hengstenberg.—Commentary on the Psalms. By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, D.D., Professor of Theology in Berlin. In Three Vols. 8vo. (33s.)

Dr. Gieseler.—Compendium of Ecclesiastical History. By J. C. L. GIESELER, D.D., Professor of Theology in Göttingen. Five Vols. 8vo. (£2, 12s. 6d.)

Dr. Olshausen.—Biblical Commentary on the Gospels and Acts. Adapted especially for Preachers and Students. By HERMANN OLSHAUSEN, D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. In Four Vols. 8vo. (£2, 2s.)—Commentary on the Romans. In One Vol. 8vo. (10s. 6d.)—Commentary on St. Paul's First and Second Epistles to the Corinthians. In One Vol. 8vo. (9s.)—Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Philippians, to Titus, and the First to Timothy. In continuation of the Work of Olshausen. By LIC. AUGUST WIESINGER. In One Vol. 8vo. (10s. 6d.)

Dr. Neander.—General History of the Christian Religion and Church. By AUGUSTUS NEANDER, D.D. Nine Vols. 8vo. (£3, 7s. 6d.)

Prof. H. A. Ch. Hävernick.—General Introduction to the Old Testament. By Professor HÄVERNICK. One Vol. 8vo. (10s. 6d.)

Dr. Müller.—The Christian Doctrine of Sin. By Dr. JULIUS MÜLLER. Two Vols. 8vo. (21s.) New Edition.

Dr. Hengstenberg.—Christology of the Old Testament, and a Commentary on the Messianic Predictions. By E. W. HENGSTENBERG, D.D. Four Vols. (£2, 2s.)

Dr. M. Baumgarten.—The Acts of the Apostles; or, The History of the Church in the Apostolic Age. By M. BAUMGARTEN, Ph.D. Three Vols. (£1, 7s.)

Dr. Stier.—The Words of the Lord Jesus. By RUDOLPH STIER, D.D., Chief Pastor and Superintendent of Schkeuditz. In Eight Vols. 8vo. (£4, 4s.)

Dr. Carl Ullmann.—Reformers before the Reformation, principally in Germany and the Netherlands. Two Vols. 8vo. (£1, 1s.)

Professor Kurtz.—History of the Old Covenant; or, Old Testament Dispensation. By Professor KURTZ of Dorpat. In Three Vols. (£1, 11s. 6d.)

Dr. Stier.—The Words of the Risen Saviour, and Commentary on the Epistle of St. James. By RUDOLPH STIER, D.D. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Professor Tholuck.—Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. One Vol. (9s.)

Professor Tholuck.—Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Dr. Hengstenberg.—On the Book of Ecclesiastes. To which are appended: Treatises on the Song of Solomon; the Book of Job; the Prophet Isaiah; the Sacrifices of Holy Scripture; and on the Jews and the Christian Church. In One Vol. 8vo. (9s.)

Dr. Ebrard.—Commentary on the Epistles of St. John. By Dr. JOHN H. A. EBRARD, Professor of Theology. In One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Dr. Lange.—Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Gospels of St. Matthew and Mark. By J. P. LANGE, D.D. Three Vols. (10s. 6d. each.)

Dr. Dorner.—History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ. By Dr. J. A. DORNER, Professor of Theology in the University of Berlin. Five Vols. (£2, 12s. 6d.)

Lange and Dr. J. J. Van Oosterzee.—Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke. Two Vols. (18s.)

Dr. Ebrard.—The Gospel History: A Compendium of Critical Investigations in support of the Historical Character of the Four Gospels. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)

Lange, Lechler, and Gerok.—Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. Edited by Dr. LANGE. Two Vols. (21s.)

Dr. Hengstenberg.—Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. Two Vols. (21s.)

Professor Keil.—Biblical Commentary on the Pentateuch. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)

CLARK'S FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY—*Continued.*

Professor Keil.—Commentary on Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Delitzsch.—A System of Biblical Psychology. One Vol. (12s.)
Dr. C. A. Auberlen.—The Divine Revelation. 8vo. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Delitzsch.—Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah. Two Vols. (21s.)
Professor Keil.—Commentary on the Books of Samuel. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Delitzsch.—Commentary on the Book of Job. Two Vols. (21s.)
Bishop Martensen.—Christian Dogmatics. A Compendium of the Doctrines of Christianity. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Dr. J. P. Lange.—Commentary on the Gospel of St. John. Two Vols. (21s.)
Professor Keil.—Commentary on the Minor Prophets. Two Vols. (21s.)
Professor Delitzsch.—Commentary on Epistle to the Hebrews. Two Vols. (21s.)
Dr. Harless.—A System of Christian Ethics. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Dr. Hengstenberg.—Commentary on Ezekiel. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Dr. Stier.—The Words of the Apostles Expounded. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Keil.—Introduction to the Old Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
Professor Bleek.—Introduction to the New Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
Professor Schmid.—New Testament Theology. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Delitzsch.—Commentary on the Psalms. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Dr. Hengstenberg.—The Kingdom of God under the Old Covenant. Two Vols. (21s.)
Professor Keil.—Commentary on the Books of Kings. One Volume. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Keil.—Commentary on the Book of Daniel. One Volume. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Keil.—Commentary on the Books of Chronicles. One Volume. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Keil.—Commentary on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Keil.—Commentary on Jeremiah. Two Vols. (21s.)
Winer (Dr. G. B.)—Collection of the Confessions of Christendom. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Bishop Martensen.—Christian Ethics. One Volume. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Delitzsch.—Commentary on the Proverbs of Solomon. Two Vols. (21s.)
Professor Oehler.—Biblical Theology of the Old Testament. Two Vols. (21s.)
Professor Christlieb.—Modern Doubt and Christian Belief. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Professor Godet.—Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel. Two Vols. (21s.)
Professor Luthardt.—Commentary on St. John's Gospel. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Professor Godet.—Commentary on St. John's Gospel. Three Vols. (31s. 6d.)
Professor Keil.—Commentary on Ezekiel. Two Vols. (21s.)
Professor Delitzsch.—Commentary on Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Gebhardt (H.)—Doctrine of the Apocalypse. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Steinmeyer (Dr. F. L.)—History of the Passion and Resurrection of our Lord. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Haupt (E.)—Commentary on the First Epistle of St. John. One Vol. (10s. 6d.)
Hagenbach (Dr. K. R.)—History of the Reformation. Two Vols. (21s.)
Philippi (Dr. F. A.)—Commentary on Romans. Two Vols. (21s.)

And, in connection with the Series—

Murphy's Commentary on the Book of Psalms. *To count as Two Volumes.* (12s.)
Alexander's Commentary on Isaiah. Two Volumes. (17s.)
Ritter's (Carl) Comparative Geography of Palestine. Four Volumes. (32s.)
Shedd's History of Christian Doctrine. Two Volumes. (21s.)
Macdonald's Introduction to the Pentateuch. Two Volumes. (21s.)
Gerlach's Commentary on the Pentateuch. 8vo. (10s. 6d.)
Dr. Hengstenberg.—Dissertations on the Genuineness of Daniel, etc. One Vol. (12s.)

The series, in 150 Volumes (including 1883), price £41. 14s. 9d., forms an *Apparatus* without which it may be truly said *no Theological Library can be complete;* and the Publishers take the liberty of suggesting that no more appropriate gift could be presented to a Clergyman than the Series, in whole or in part.

*** NO DUPLICATES *can be included in the Selection of Twenty Volumes; and it will save trouble and correspondence if it be distinctly understood that* NO LESS *number than Twenty can be supplied, unless at non-subscription price.*

Subscribers' Names received by all Retail Booksellers.

LONDON: (*For Works at Non-subscription price only*) HAMILTON, ADAMS, & Co.

LANGE'S COMMENTARIES.

(*Subscription price, nett*), 15s. each.

THEOLOGICAL AND HOMILETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

Specially designed and adapted for the use of Ministers and Students. By Prof. JOHN PETER LANGE, D.D., in connection with a number of eminent European Divines. Translated, enlarged, and revised under the general editorship of Rev. Dr. PHILIP SCHAFF, assisted by leading Divines of the various Evangelical Denominations.

OLD TESTAMENT—14 VOLUMES.

I. **GENESIS.** With a General Introduction to the Old Testament. By Prof. J. P. LANGE, D.D. Translated from the German, with Additions, by Prof. TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D., and A. GOSMAN, D.D. —II. **EXODUS** and **LEVITICUS.** By J. P. LANGE, D.D. With General Introduction by Rev. Dr. OSGOOD.—III. **NUMBERS.** By Prof. J. P. LANGE, D.D. **DEUTERONOMY.** By W. J. SCHROEDER. —IV. **JOSHUA.** By Rev. F. R. FAY. **JUDGES** and **RUTH.** By Prof. PAULUS CASSELL, D.D.—V. **SAMUEL.** By Professor ERDMANN, D.D.—VI. **KINGS.** By KARL CHR. W. F BAHR, D.D.—VII. **CHRONICLES.** By OTTO ZÖCKLER. **EZRA.** By FR. W. SCHULTZ. **NEHEMIAH.** By Rev. HOWARD CROSBY, D.D., LL.D. **ESTHER.** By FR. W. SCHULTZ.—VIII. **JOB.** With an Introduction and Annotations by Prof. TAYLER LEWIS, LL.D. A Commentary by Dr. OTTO ZÖCKLER, together with an Introductory Essay on Hebrew Poetry by Prof. PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.—IX. **THE PSALMS.** By C. B. MOLL, D.D.—X. **PROVERBS, ECCLESIASTES,** and **THE SONG OF SOLOMON.** By Prof. O. ZÖCKLER, D.D.—XI. **ISAIAH.** By C. W. E. NAEGELSBACH.—XII. **JEREMIAH** and **LAMENTATIONS.** By C. W.E. NAEGELSBACH, D.D.—XIII. **EZEKIEL.** By F. W. SCHRÖDER, D.D. **DANIEL.** By Professor ZÖCKLER, D.D.—XIV. **THE MINOR PROPHETS. HOSEA, JOEL,** and **AMOS.** By OTTO SCHMOLLER, Ph.D. **OBADIAH, MICAH, JONAH, NAHUM, HABAKKUK,** and **ZEPHANIAH.** By Rev. PAUL KLEINERT. **HAGGAI.** By Rev. JAMES E. M'CURDY. **ZECHARIAH.** By T. W. CHAMBERS, D.D. **MALACHI.** By JOSEPH PACKARD, D.D.

THE APOCRYPHA. By E. C. BISSELL, D.D. One Volume.

NEW TESTAMENT—10 VOLUMES.

I. **MATTHEW.** With a General Introduction to the New Testament. By J. P. LANGE, D.D. Translated, with Additions, by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.—II. **MARK.** By J. P. LANGE, D.D. **LUKE.** By J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE.—III. **JOHN.** By J. P. LANGE, D.D.—IV. **ACTS.** By G. V. LECHLER, D.D., and Rev CHARLES GEROK.—V. **ROMANS.** By J. P. LANGE, D.D., and Rev. F. R. FAY.—VI. **CORINTHIANS.** By CHRISTIAN F. KLING.—VII. **GALATIANS.** By OTTO SCHMOLLER, Ph.D. **EPHESIANS, COLOSSIANS,** and **PHILIPPIANS.** By KARL BRAUNE, D.D.—VIII. **THESSALONIANS.** By Drs. AUBERLEN and RIGGENBACH. **TIMOTHY, TITUS,** and **PHILEMON.** By J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, D.D. **HEBREWS.** By KARL B. MOLL, D.D.—IX. **JAMES.** By J. P. LANGE, D.D., and J. J. VAN OOSTERZEE, D.D. **PETER** and **JUDE.** By G. F. C. FRONMÜLLER, Ph.D. **JOHN.** By KARL BRAUNE, D.D.—X. **THE REVELATION OF JOHN.** By Dr. J. P. LANGE. Together with double Alphabetical Index to all the Ten Volumes on the New Testament, by JOHN H. WOODS.

PROFESSOR EADIE'S COMMENTARIES.

MESSRS. CLARK, with the concurrence of the Trustees of the late PROFESSOR EADIE, beg to announce the issue, in Four Volumes 8vo, of the following Commentaries:—

GALATIANS. EPHESIANS. PHILIPPIANS. COLOSSIANS.

The Four Volumes will be supplied by Subscription at the price of

TWENTY-FOUR SHILLINGS,

or, in separate Volumes, at Ten Shillings and Sixpence each.

They have been carefully Edited by

The Rev. WILLIAM YOUNG, M.A., Glasgow.

The value of these Commentaries is well known. They occupy a first and distinctive place in New Testament exegetical literature.

Three of these Volumes have been out of print for a considerable time, and all of them are much in demand.

KEIL AND DELITZSCH'S
COMMENTARIES ON AND INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION, 2 Vols.	(*Keil*).
PENTATEUCH, 3 Vols.	(*Keil*).
JOSHUA, JUDGES, and RUTH, 1 Vol.	(*Keil*).
SAMUEL, 1 Vol.	(*Keil*).
KINGS, 1 Vol., and CHRONICLES, 1 Vol.	(*Keil*).
EZRA, NEHEMIAH, and ESTHER, 1 Vol.	(*Keil*).
JOB, 2 Vols.	(*Delitzsch*).
PSALMS, 3 Vols.	(*Delitzsch*).
PROVERBS, 2 Vols.	(*Delitzsch*).
ECCLESIASTES and SONG OF SOLOMON	(*Delitzsch*).
ISAIAH, 2 Vols.	(*Delitzsch*).
JEREMIAH and LAMENTATIONS, 2 Vols.	(*Keil*).
EZEKIEL, 2 Vols.	(*Keil*).
DANIEL, 1 Vol.	(*Keil*).
MINOR PROPHETS, 2 Vols.	(*Keil*).

THE above series (published in Clark's Foreign Theological Library) is now completed in 27 Volumes, and Messrs. Clark will supply it at the Subscription price, in COMPLETE SETS (*only*), of £7, 2s.

Separate volumes may be had at the non-subscription price of 10*s.* 6*d. each.*

So complete a Critical and Exegetical Apparatus on the Old Testament is not elsewhere to be found in the English language, and at the present time, when the study of the Old Testament is more widely extended than perhaps ever before, it is believed this offer will be duly appreciated.

'This series is one of great importance to the biblical scholar, and as regards its general execution, it leaves little or nothing to be desired.'—*Edinburgh Review.*

'We have often expressed our opinion of Dr. Delitzsch's great merits as a commentator, and, in particular, of his portion of the admirable Commentary on the Old Testament, written by himself and Dr. Keil, that we need only now congratulate our readers on the completion of the entire work.'—*Church Bells.*

'The authors are among the most accomplished of living Hebraists, and Delitzsch is, in addition, a man of fine historical imagination, and of clear spiritual vision.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

'A more important contribution than this series of commentaries has, we think, never been presented to English theological students.'—*Rock.*

'Very high merit, for thorough Hebrew scholarship, and for keen critical sagacity, belongs to these Old Testament Commentaries. No scholar will willingly dispense with them.'—*British Quarterly Review.*

'The very valuable Keil and Delitzsch series of Commentaries.'—*Wesleyan Methodist Magazine.*

In One Volume, 8vo, price 12s.,

A SYSTEM OF BIBLICAL PSYCHOLOGY.

By F. DELITZSCH, D.D.

By the same Author.

In Two Volumes, 8vo, price 21s.,

COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

In Twenty Handsome 8vo Volumes, SUBSCRIPTION PRICE £5, 5s.,

MEYER'S
Commentary on the New Testament.

'Meyer has been long and well known to scholars as one of the very ablest of the German expositors of the New Testament. We are not sure whether we ought not to say that he is unrivalled as an interpreter of the grammatical and historical meaning of the sacred writers. The Publishers have now rendered another seasonable and important service to English students in producing this translation.'—*Guardian.*

Each Volume will be sold separately at 10s. 6d. to Non-Subscribers.

CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL
COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY DR. H. A. W. MEYER,
OBERCONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER.

The portion contributed by Dr. MEYER has been placed under the editorial care of Rev. Dr. DICKSON, Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow; Rev. Dr. CROMBIE, Professor of Biblical Criticism, St. Mary's College, St. Andrews; and Rev. Dr. STEWART, Professor of Biblical Criticism, University of Glasgow.

1st Year—**Romans**, Two Volumes.
Galatians, One Volume.
St. John's Gospel, Vol. I.

2d Year—**St. John's Gospel**, Vol. II.
Philippians and Colossians, One Volume.
Acts of the Apostles, Vol. I.
Corinthians, Vol. I.

3d Year—**Acts of the Apostles**, Vol. II.
St. Matthew's Gospel, Two Volumes.
Corinthians, Vol. II.

4th Year—**Mark and Luke**, Two Volumes.
Ephesians and Philemon, One Volume.
Thessalonians. (*Dr. Lünemann.*)

5th Year—**Timothy and Titus.** (*Dr. Huther.*)
Peter and Jude. (*Dr. Huther.*)
Hebrews. (*Dr. Lünemann.*)
James and John. (*Dr. Huther.*)

The series, as written by Meyer himself, is completed by the publication of Ephesians with Philemon in one volume. But to this the Publishers have thought it right to add Thessalonians and Hebrews, by Dr. Lünemann, and the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles, by Dr. Huther. So few, however, of the Subscribers have expressed a desire to have Dr. Düsterdieck's Commentary on Revelation included, that it has been resolved in the meantime not to undertake it.

'I need hardly add that the last edition of the accurate, perspicuous, and learned commentary of Dr. Meyer has been most carefully consulted throughout; and I must again, as in the preface to the Galatians, avow my great obligations to the acumen and scholarship of the learned editor.'—BISHOP ELLICOTT *in Preface to his 'Commentary on Ephesians.'*

'The ablest grammatical exegete of the age.'—PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.

'In accuracy of scholarship and freedom from prejudice, he is equalled by few.'—*Literary Churchman.*

'We have only to repeat that it remains, of its own kind, the very best Commentary of the New Testament which we possess.'—*Church Bells.*

'No exegetical work is on the whole more valuable, or stands in higher public esteem. As a critic he is candid and cautious; exact to minuteness in philology; a master of the grammatical and historical method of interpretation.'—*Princeton Review.*

Date Due

FACULTY

FACULTY

JAN 6 1998

BV4390 .C62C84 c.2
Modern criticism and Clement's Epistles
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00014 7860